THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXXVIII.—JULY, 1913—No. 151.

THE PRESENT PROSPECTS OF ANGLICANISM.

THERE is no religious body in Western Christendom that matters so much to the Catholic Church as the Church of England and the religious organizations in communion with it. On the one hand, in England, at any rate, and probably elsewhere, the Anglican Church occupies ground which the Catholic Church might otherwise hope to possess. There is a good deal of truth in the saying attributed to Disraeli that the Catholic Church is the residuary legatee of the Church of England. Certainly the type of mind and character which the Anglican body is now producing in fairly large quantities—the educated and thoughtful High Churchmen, who believe in the Real Presence and look with favor on the practice of confession—would find it difficult to find a permanent home in any existing body of Nonconformists. And there can be no doubt that there are Anglicans who would even welcome the disappearance or absorption of a body which stands between them and their natural home.

On the other hand, Newman and others have justly recognized that the Anglican Church operates as a breakwater between England and unbelief. And as long as that is so, many Catholics will be willing to forget the extent to which the Establishment has been a persecuting and is still an Erastian body, and to give it a measure of support against a mort reckless and dangerous foe. In Newman's own words we may lawfully "wish to suffer the Church of England. The Establishment has ever been a breakwater against

---

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1913, by J. P. Turner, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

Unitarianism, fanaticism and infidelity. It has ever loved us better than Puritans or Independents have loved us, and it receives all that abuse and odium of dogmatism, or at least a good deal of it, which otherwise would be directed against us."

The special and permanent characteristic of the Anglican Church in its English home has always been its subordination to the State. It has been at different times High Church, Low Church and Broad Church. It has been Jacobite, Tory and Whig, but through all these changes it has loyally offered to Caesar the things that are God's. And the importance of the last century is that we have seen a breaking up of the long frost and a gradual shifting of the ancient landmarks. The sway of the State has been questioned, and there are signs that the old order changes, giving place to new.

This change has taken place in different ways, both near the centre and at the circumference. In olden days there was little or no difference between High and Low Churchmen in their attitude to the State. The Royal Supremacy was frankly accepted by all as the only practical alternative to the supremacy of the Pope. Laud was as Erastian as Whitgift. But in our time this one common bond of union between different parties has been rudely challenged by a portion, at any rate, of the High party. It is not true to say that this protest is due to the one-sided character of the decisions of the Privy Council, for the Tractarians were, if possible, more consistently anti-Erastian than the Ritualists. At any rate, the ideal presented in the Tracts has hardly been realized in practice, though it has influenced a great variety of minds.

But, further, the claim has been made, and perhaps with some measure of justice, that the Anglican communion as a whole is a very different thing from the insular and narrow and Erastian Church of England. The American and Colonial Churches are becoming more and more dissatisfied with their captive parent at home, for the glorious comprehensiveness of the Church of England does not appeal to her stalwart sons across the seas. The Church of England does not know her own mind, as Cecil Rhodes told her to her face, but the Colonial Churches do. They are linked to Canterbury by the ties of history and sentiment, but none the less they are free. The old Church at home may be paying a bitter tribute to Cranmer and Parker, but the Scottish Church, the American Church, the Canadian Church, the Church of China, the Church of Japan, the Church of South Africa, the Church of Australia, the Church of Ireland and the magnificent diocese of the Falkland Isles are in proud possession of a nobler heritage. They are the heirs of the ages. They represent, so an Anglican apologist has told us, "the faith of our Saxon forefathers." They also succeed in representing "the faith of Anselm, Stephen Langton and of Laud and the Caroline divines." With such a record as this, what place can there be for counsels of despair?

True, there are difficulties about accepting this glowing picture au pied de la lettre. It is, as the saying is, almost too good to be true. That Churches admittedly not themselves Erastian should be able to rid themselves completely of the strain of contingent Erastianism, that they are in this respect as though the Tudor Reformation had never been, seems antecedently improbable. And while we may be ready to admit that the daughter Churches, taken one by one, are much more homogeneous than the Two Provinces of Canterbury and York, yet there is an impression, which the Lambeth Conferences have not seriously weakened, that High Church, Broad Church and Low Church find each his appropriate fortress in Africa, America and Australia, and that the great Pan-Anglican Federation presents the same interminable varieties of altitude and shades of opinion as the Island Church, which is the mother of them all.

It is admitted by Archdeacon Wirgman in a recent article in *The Oxford and Cambridge Review,** on "The Anglican Communion and the Church of England," that "the idea of '*National* Churches,' as distinct from the legitimate autonomy of a 'Province,' is utterly foreign to the ideal of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, which is the outcome of Pentecost." And such an admission coming from a writer of such weight and learning, whose praise is in all the Anglican Churches, deserves to be rescued from the oblivion which too often overtakes a magazine article and to be set in the very forefront of the controversial battle. For if the ideal of the Church of England, which is the root and womb of these federated Anglican Churches, is utterly foreign to the ideal of the Christian Church, and if they are the offspring of a confessedly anti-Catholic institution, we have a right to ask on what grounds it is held that they themselves are not uncatholic. To the mere onlooker it would seem that they have cheerfully added to the original sin of the Protestant Reformation. They are maintaining each for itself the right to be a National Church, to go its own way, to repudiate at will the Thirty-nine Articles, to act each for itself as if it were the only Church in Christendom, to honor the saints in Africa, to dishonor them in Ireland and to retain as their only bond of union a common link of sentiment to Canterbury and a common severance from Rome. The Anglican Churches cannot afford to repudiate Canterbury, because Canterbury is supposed to be their one link with the old Church and the old religion. But in sober truth Canterbury has abandoned the old religion and broken communion with the ancient Church. Even if, by some topsy-turvy arrangement, Canterbury were to receive again the old religion from the daughter Churches, which are said to stand for "the faith of their Saxon forefathers," they cannot restore her to communion with the Apostolic See. They cannot stand by Canterbury without standing by her past. Not in England only, but everywhere the Anglican communion stands for the right of the State to set up a National Church, utterly foreign to the ideal of the One Holy Catholic Church.

---

* *The Oxford and Cambridge Review,* October, 1912, page 117.

The truth is that Canterbury, venerated by Catholicizing Anglicans as the See of Augustine and Anselm and Becket, is itself the head and front of the offending. It has repudiated communion with the Holy See; it has flouted the judgment and authority of the *Orbis terrarum.* And so it is the centre of Anglican Christendom, but a centre without authority. It is open to any of the Churches grouped around it to teach the traditional Protestantism of the Church of England, or to teach whatever they like, and to call that teaching the Catholic faith. It is open to them to claim as their own, if they care to claim it, the universal Canon Law of Christendom, and to put it into practice as far as their peculiar relations to the Holy See permit. Or it is equally open to them, as far as Canterbury cares about the mattter, to say that they know nothing about the Canon Law, except such canons as they mad have made for themselves. The freedom claimed for Churches of the Anglican communion is nothing less than freedom to develop each on their own lines, to be High Church, or Low Church, or Broad Church without restraint, unhampered by the State, unhampered by the Articles, unhampered by tradition. And by a curious irony the real common centre for business purposes of this *Ecclesia alterius orbis* is to be found not at Canterbury, but at Westminster—I mean, of course, the Church House at Westminster.

The Anglican communion stands everywhere for separation from the Apostolic See. The whole question of ecclesiastical jurisdiction has to be treated on an anti-Roman basis, however difficult this may be to reconcile with "the universal Canon Law of Christendom." Just as among Catholics communion with Rome is treated as the test of Catholic fellowship, so that "whoever eats the Lamb outside this house is profane," so with the Anglicans communion with Rome is everywhere treated as a crucial test of schism. In Africa, in America, in Canada, in India, in Japan, Anglican Bishops are compelled to make this the test. To communicate with Rome is to renounce communion with the Church of England. And as long as the Anglican communion lasts as a distinct communion, it must last on this basis.

If it is true that the Churches of Greater Britain have raised the tone of the whole communion, it is not less true that they have destroyed the frail theory on which the Anglican claim to jurisdiction is based. The original notion was that whatever might be said about Scotland and Ireland, the Anglican claim to the lawful possession of the provinces of Canterbury and York was practically beyond dispute, except by denying that the Protestant Bishops were Bishops at all. But when the most local and insular of Christian denominations began a career of ecclesiastical aggression and the conquest of Greater Britain a new theory had to be framed to fit the facts, and it was discovered that even in Catholic Canada jurisdiction follows the flag. But even this new Erastianism fails to keep pace with Pan-Anglican ambition. The Bishop of the Falkland Islands has lately published a map of his magnificent diocese. The unlearned might have supposed, if he had let the mattter alone, that he was following the flag to some remote islands of the South Atlantic. Whereas, in point of fact, his Lordship is the proud administrator of the largest diocese in the world. Chile is of no account; Argentina is too little for him; he is the chief pastor of a continent, and his jurisdiction extends from Panama to Cape Horn.

But if the Anglican Churches are incurably National and inextricably involved in the misdoings of the Reformation, it is at least claimed on their behalf that they are neither homes of heresy nor "cities of confusion." It has even been maintained by the writer already referred to and by other learned writers of the Anglican communion that they "represent the faith of our Saxon forefathers, the faith of Anselm and Stephen Langton and of Laud and the Caroline divines." One is amazed at the moderation that omits the names of Blessed John Fisher and Blessed Thomas More. It is true that our Saxon forefathers and our Norman Bishops were Papists, and that Laud and the Carolines, with all their excellencies, were not. It is true that this rejection of the Papacy is the most manifest common ground between the religion of the Carolines and the religion of the ordinary English Churchman of the present day. It is true that Protestant "martyrs" gave their lives to free England from the faith of Anselm, and that Mass priests were hanged and drawn and quartered in the days of Laud, but the theory of doctrinal continuity is essential to the mere statement of the Anglo-Catholic position; and if the facts will not bear it out, so much the worse for the facts.

The truth is that Anglican writers suffer from a chronic inability to see things as they really are. They form a theory and then shut their eyes to the more disagreeable facts of the situation. It is the Anglican habit of mind. The English Church would not work if there did not exist within it an established tradition of ignoring the existence of evils that cannot be removed or defended. Bishops and missioners pass daily in their minstrations from Churches which are indistinguishable from those of Catholics to Churches which are Genevan in their desolation. Priests who reject the whole sacramental system and priests who believe and teach the Infallibility of the Pope are ordained by the same Bishop and kneel at the same altar side by side.

The claim of such an organization to unity and Catholicity of doctrine is so manifestly preposterous that it is difficult to listen to it with any pretense of patience. It is impossible to get under way with the theory at all without making believe that the normal Anglican is at least a decided High Churchman, who is generous enough to put up with the presence in his communion of a few persons of questionable orthodoxy. How false this is to the facts need not be insisted on. But even if we were to allow this extraordinary assumption to pass muster, the chief difficulty would remain unremoved. It is not the presence of heretics which is the final and conclusive refutation of the Anglican position, but the impossibility of locating the orthodox. The crux of the Anglo-Catholic position lies in the interminable sub-divisions of the High Church party and the dismal uncertainty of its relations to the Catholic faith and the Catholic Church. The majority of High Churchmen are no doubt satisfied supporters of the present state of things—they are Protestants when it comes to the point, though they wear their rue with a difference—but there are others in the camp who with some measure of earnestness profess and call themselves "Catholics." These are they who take for their guide, as far as they are able, the decrees of Trent and banish or explain, according to their temperament, the Thirty-nine Articles. The Vatican Council was a source of great disappointment to them, and for a time they put their hopes on Döllinger. But forty years of observation and reflection have made a difference, and the failure of the "Old Catholic" movement has been conspicuous. And, after all, one cannot expect people who daily recite the Breviary to be very clear and strong in their opposition to the Chair of Peter.

And indeed one cannot help feeling some measure of grim amusement when one thinks of the number of Anglican parsons who spent their holiday last year in fathoming the mysteries of the New Psalter. Here are the most zealous and devoted of the clergy of a sect whose history has been one long crusade against the authority and jurisdiction of the Holy See making a change, no doubt painful to some, in the devotional habits of years, in ready obedience to a word from the Vicar of Christ, although that word of command was certainly not addressed to them. We can but pray that those who have so swiftly obeyed in that which is less may soon have grace to obey in that which is greater. But the practical importance of the act of obedience to the Holy See, the actual recognition of Peter speaking by Pius, cannot easily be exaggerated.

The position taken by these would-be Catholics is interesting enough, and may lead to remarkable practical results in the near future. But even if we waive the question of their fewness and their failure to agree even with each other, they can hardly claim to be the "orthodox" whom we are seeking. They do not pay obedience either to Canterbury or Rome, for it is not "obedience" to obey when we like and disobey when we like, at our own private judgment and discretion. They submit to the Vatican decree when it tells them that the Holy Father teaches infallibly, and they resist the same authority when it tells them of his sovereignty in whatsoever belongs to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world, and the need of unity both of communion and of confession of faith. But if we cannot recognize them as orthodox, neither can we pretend to think that they have any sort of claim to speak for the Anglican communion. Never at any time have the authorities of the Protestant Episcopal Churches spoken in their sense, nor can they, except at their peril, make public avowal of their acceptance of the teaching of Rome.

A position of this sort cannot last; it is too devoid of any logical foundation and too out of touch with the facts of daily life. It is evident that the Anglican authorities wish to deal tenderly with it and to obtain as much profit out of it as they can, and as little loss. But the opportunity is ours, not theirs. The new wine of Catholicism must burst the old bottle; no power on earth can prevent it. And the story of Caldey will repeat itself in many different forms, but with one uniform result. *Levate oculos vestros et videte regiones, quia albae sunt jam ad messam.*

A. H. A. NANKIVELL.

Dorking, England.

CATHOLIC AND MODERNIST THEORIES OF DEVELOPMENT.

IN order to complete the outline already given of the Modernists' conception of doctrinal evolution, it is necessary to draw attention to another source of the necessary variability of dogmas in their system. Catholics have always held that, far as God is removed by His infinite nature and simplicity above the comprehension of man, yet He is able to communicate a true knowledge of Himself and of the spiritual world to men's minds by means of revealed analogical concepts and judgments which, taken together, give us a sufficient apprehension of things divine. This the Modernist altogether denies. No such thing is possible, Those analogical concepts and judgments which we call revealed dogmas, and which are, for the Catholic, a valid medium by which the thoughts of God are conveyed to men, and communicated to others by those who first received them, are for the Modernist, as we have seen, merely of human elaboration.

The only revelation of God is from the divine immanent in man and acting upon the *religious sense.* Now, this action, and the religious emotions arising therefrom, will differ in individuals and in races and at various times, not only on account of the subjective and personal nature of the religious sense itself and its varying degrees of cultivation or acuteness, but also and more essentially because "the object of the *religious sense,* as something contained in the *absolute,* possesses an infinite variety of aspects, of which now one, now another, may present itself."[1] Thus if at one time or to certain persons the absolute acts upon the religious sense in such a way as to produce in the intellect the idea of a Trinity of Persons in the Godhead, the dogma of the Trinity is formulated and for such persons and under such circumstances is true, that is, with a relative and symbolical truth; and the believer is justified, according to the principles of "pragmatism" that are part of the Modernist scheme, in so comporting himself towards God as if He *were* Three Persons in one Divine Nature. But here again, should some other aspect of the Absolute present itself, should the experiences of the religious sense consequently be more aptly represented by another, even contradictory formula, the latter would be equally "true" and equally valuable as being in accordance with "life" or, in reality, with the subjective emotions and ideas of the individual. Thus, as Pius X. points out, "he who believes can avail himself of varying conditions. Consequently, the formulæ which we call dogma must be subject to these vicissitudes and are therefore liable to change. Thus the way is open to the *intrinsic evolution* of dogma. Here we have an immense structure of sophisms which ruin and wreck all religion."[2]

---

[1] Encyc., p. 14.

Thus we have, to speak generally, a twofold reason for the variability and evolution of dogmas in the Modernist system—the varying aspects under which the Object of faith presents itself and the variability of the intellectual equipment of different times and persons for the endeavor to express those aspects of the divine in human concepts and speech.

It has been said that the Encyclical against Modernism condemned the idea of Development, root and branch. But we have the evidence of Pius X.'s own words to the contrary. It is very unusual for a Papal document to condemn teaching that for centuries has been current in the Catholic theological schools. If ever the teaching, even of one recognized school of theology, is condemned, the condemnation is couched in the plainest terms. There is nothing in the Encyclical to lead us to suppose that the current teaching concerning doctrinal development, as summed up, for instance, in the classical treatise "De Traditione" of Cardinal Franzelin, has been reprobated by the Holy See. What the Pope condemns is the Modernist theory of the intrinsic evolution of dogmas. As a matter of fact, the Encyclical, following the Vatican Council, fully recognizes the important place held by doctrinal development in the life of the Catholic Church. "It is thus," writes Pius X, "that for the Modernists . . . there is to be nothing stable, nothing immutable in the Church. . . . On the subject of revelation and dogma in particular the doctrine of the Modernists offers nothing new. We find it condemned in the Syllabus of Pius IX., where it is enunciated in these terms: 'Divine revelation is imperfect, and therefore subject to continual and indefinite progress, corresponding with the progress of human reason;'[3] and condemned still more solemnly in the Vatican Council: 'The doctrine of the faith which God has revealed" has not been proposed to human intelligences to be perfected by them as if it were a philosophical system, but as a divine deposit entrusted to the Spouse of Christ to be faithfully guarded and infallibly interpreted. Hence also that sense of the sacred dogmas is to be perpetually retained which our Holy Mother the Church has once declared, nor is this sense ever to be abandoned on plea or pretext of a more profound comprehension of the truth."[4]

Nor is *the development of our knowledge,* even concerning the faith, barred by this pronouncement; on the contrary, it is supported and maintained."[5] The Holy Father is here repeating, in other words, a famous principle laid down long ago by Albert the Great and adopted by Cardinal Franzelin in his treatise on divine tradition. "Est hic," writes the Cardinal, "ut brevissime dixit Albertus Magnus, 'potius profectus fidelis in fide, quam fidei in fideli,' *i. e.*, profectus explicitae et distinctae cognitionis objecti fidei, non incrementum ipsius objecti in se."[6] It may well be that theologians now will avoid the term *evolution* when speaking of the process of doctrinal development, though before the appearance of the Encyclical "Pascendi" it had come into use, needless to say in the right sense, amongst writers of unimpeachable orthodoxy. Thus Father Billot, S. J., in his treatise "De Traditione," specially written to combat what he rightly terms "novam haeresim evolutionismi," says, "unde tandem consequitur, *evolutionem* quamdam et quemdam profectum esse in traditione procul dubium agnoscendum,"[7] and the present writer remembers hearing him speak in one of his lectures at the Gregorian University in Rome of "sana et legitima evolutio doctrinae." Franzelin generally uses the word "explicatio." It is a question of avoiding a term that has acquired an heretical sense at the hands of Modernists. Whether we use the term evolution or not, recent events and the teaching of the Encyclical would seem to bring us back to the dictum of Albert the Great and to confine development to the progress of our knowledge and understanding of the objective body of truth delivered to the Church by Jesus Christ and His holy Apostles. "Here," as an interesting writer on this subject has recently said, "is a clear concept of that which does grow. It is the subjective understanding of the dogma that grows. The objective body of truth does not grow. The sense of the dogma as understood by the Apostles remains the same. It were, therefore, somewhat of a misnomer, especially at a time when rationalist terminology is so popular, to speak of the evolution or development of dogma. Understood in the subjective sense, the terms are permissible. But, owing to their liability to be taken in an objective sense, I think it were better to speak rather of the evolution or the development of the dogmatic science."[8] It is perhaps scarcely likely that the change of terminology suggested by this writer will come about, as we are so used to speak of "development of doctrine" or "of dogmas," and theologians commonly admit a growth of the object of faith, "secundum quid,"[9] basing their doctrine upon the words of St. Vincent of Lerins adopted by the Vatican Council:

---

[2] Encyc., p. 7.

[3] Syll., Prop. 5.

[4] Nat. Conc. Const. "Dei Filius," Cap. IV.

---

[5] Encyc., p. 23. The original runs: "quo profecto explicatio nostrarum notionum, tantum abest ut impediatur, ut imo adjuvetur et provehatur." The italics above are mine.

[6] "De divina traditione et scriptura." Ed. 1896, Roma, p. 280.

[7] *Op. cit.*, "Procemium," p. 10. Italics mine.

[8] "The Wayfarer's Vision," by the Rev. T. J. Gerrard. London, 1909, p. 39.

"Crescat et multum vehementerque proficiat tam singulorum quam omnium, tam unius hominis, quam totius ecclesiae, aetatum ac saeculorum gradibus, intelligentia, scientia, sapientia, etc."[10]

The phraseology is likely to stand, but it is clear and is now likely to be still clearer that the growth of doctrine is growth in the understanding of the deposit, not any growth of the object of faith *in se*. "Forsitan dicit aliquis," writes St. Vincent of Lerins.[11] "Nullusne ergo in Ecclesia Christi profectus habebitur religionis? Habeatur plane et maximus. Nam quis ille est tam invidus hominibus, tam exosus Deo, qui istud prohibere conetur? Sed ita tamen ut vere profectus sit ille fidei, non permutatio. Siquidem ad profectum pertinet, ut in semetipsum unaquaeque res amplificetur; ad permutationem vero, ut aliquid ex alio in aliud transvertatur." Again: "Ita etiam christianae religionis dogma sequatur hae decet profectum leges, ut annis scilicet consolidetur, dilatetur tempore, sublimetur aetate, incorruptum tamen illibatumque permaneat, et universis partium suarum mensaris cunctisque quasi memberis ac sensibus propriis plenum atque perfectum sit, quod nihil praeterea permutationis admittat, nulla proprietatis dispendia, nullam definitionis sustineat varietatem."[12]

It will be observed that St. Vincent of Lerins speaks of "profectus religionis," a growth of religion, and "profectus fidei," a growth of the faith. Following his treatment of the question of development, the Archbishop and Bishops of the Province of Westminster, in a joint pastoral letter against "Liberal Catholicism" in the year 1900 (a document which received a special letter of approbation from Leo XIII.), speaks also of the faith itself growing:

"We . . . hold that the Church, as the Divine Teacher, is identical with herself in every age. . . . The Church is continuous and indefectible in her existence and constitution; so also in her doctrine. But her continuity and indefectibility is that of a living organic being, animated by the Holy Ghost. It is not the changeless continuity of the dead letter of a book or the indefectibility of a lifeless statue. Living beings are never stationary; they grow while they maintain their identity. The Church also grows.

---

[9] *E. g.*, Tanquery, "Synopsis Theologiae Dogmaticae," Vol. I., Cap. I., Thesis II. "Post Apostolorum tempora, articuli fidei non creverunt simpliciter, sed secundum quid."

[10] Vat. Conc., Sess. III., Cap. IV. Denz., 1647.

[11] "Communitorium. Opuscula Selecta Sanctorum Patrum," ed. H. Hurter, S. J., Vol. XIX., pp. 215, *ss*.

[12] *Op. cit.*, p. 217.

She has a progress, an evolution of her own. Not only do the faithful grow in the faith, but faith itself may be said to grow as a child grows in its own form and character, or as a tree in its own unmistakable properties. Such development implies no essential change. Essential change is not development, progress or evolution, but—the destruction of what was and the substitution for it of something else. As St. Vincent of Lerins wrote fifteen centuries ago: 'It is the property of progress that a thing be developed in itself: it is the property of change that a thing be altered from what it was into something else.' It was thus that a father of the Church in the fifth century understood the unity of doctrine which constitutes the internal and substantial unity of the Church—a unity always fixed and determinate in its principles and in harmony with its original in the deposit of truth, progressive in the inferences, definitions and applications to which the original doctrine is rightly and logically extended."[13] "Omnis similitudo claudicat," and it is conceivable, because it has happened, that the comparison of the faith to living, organic bodies should have been carried too far, and the admission of a *subjective* growth in the faith or of an *incrementum objecti fidei secundum quid* should have been extended to cover theories involving a real incorporation into Catholic dogma of extraneous matter, and going much farther than the "explicatio" of Catholic theologians and of the Encyclical "Pascendi;" but since the rise and condemnation of Modernism, it is likely that those who have seen in development not merely the unfolding of what was really contained in the deposit of faith all along, but a process by which one set of truths as it were *generates* others, will revise their ideas and come back to the old concept of "explication" that has so often been branded as *a priori* and unhistorical. "By their fruits ye shall know them," and the notion of the incorporation and assimilation of fresh matter into the body of Catholic doctrine has resulted in the Modernist theory of a living "germ" as the origin and explanation of all religion, assimilating and subduing to itself the varying and inconsistent products of human science and opinion. It is difficult to see how any theory of real incorporation in the body of Catholic truth of doctrines drawn from outside its original range can escape the condemnation meted out to the theory of Günther, or Catholic doctrine itself escape, on such a theory, that progressive alteration for which he contended; and if appeal is made to supposed historical "facts" in support of the theory, it may be replied that orthodox theologians have afforded a perfectly good explanation of the use of philosophical terms in the definition of dogmas, and that the history which leaves out of account the authoritative tradition of Catholic theology upon the matter is itself unhistorical and unscientific.[14] *"O Timothee,"* writes St. Vincent of Lerins, *"depositum custodi, devitans profanas vocum novitates. Depositum,* inquit, *custodi.* Quid est depositum? id est, quod tibi creditum est, non quod excogitasti; rem non ingenii, sed doctrinae; non usurpationis privatae, sed publicae traditionis, rem ad te perductam, non a te prolatam; in qua non auctor debes esse, sed custos, non institutor, sed sectator; non ducens, sed sequens. *Depositum,* inquit, *custodi;* catholicae fidei talentum inviolatum illibatumque conserva. Quod tibi creditum, hoc penes te maneat, hoc a te tradatur. . . . Intelligatur te exponente illustrius quod ante obscurius credebatur. Per te posteritas intellectum gratuletur quod ante vetustas non intellectum venerabatur. Eadem tamen quae didicisti doce: ut cum dicas nove, non dicas nova." And it is not only of individuals that this is said, but of the Church; for he writes: "Quis est hodie *Timotheus,* nisi vel generaliter universa Ecclesia, vel specialiter totum corpus praepositorum, qui integram divini cultus scientiam vel haberi ipsi debent vel aliis infundere?"[15] When, in carrying out this exposition of the faith here commended by St. Vincent of Lerins, the Church uses the phraseology of current philosophy or science, she is not incorporating new truths foreign to the deposit, but making use of language that men will understand in order to expound more clearly the doctrines committed to her from the beginning.

---

[13] Joint Pastoral Letter, official edition, pp. 19-20.

The study of Development has for its object, as we have said, to reconcile the apparent discrepancy between the inviolability and unalterability of the deposit and the growth or *profectus* evident in the history of dogmas and spoken of by St. Vincent of Lerins and theologians after his time. It remains now to see how the Catholic view of development effects that reconciliation, and at the same time to contrast still further the orthodox and the Modernist conceptions of the matter.

Catholics hold to the possibility and the fact of a divine communication of supernatural truths to men. To use the words of a writer already quoted, they hold that "above this natural cosmos there is a mystical cosmos of such a kind as to be unknowable to us, unless manifested by some Power who is Lord over both. And just as this natural world constitutes one organic whole, so the mystical world constitutes one organic whole. The whole of the mystical world has not been made known, but only so much as God in His wise economy has thought fit to make known. In general outline it is recognized as a Blessed Trinity, an Incarnation and a system of grace."[16] God's revelation of this mystical cosmos through Jesus Christ and the Apostles was final. What He has made known of it is the object of our faith, and no *more* of the object of faith has been made or will be made matter of public revelation than was so made at the beginning of the Christian religion. Once for all the faith was delivered to the saints. Progress, increase, development are in our knowledge and realizing of the full contents and signification of the vast treasure of truth contained in the deposit. Nothing ever can be brought out of the deposit which has not always been contained therein one way or another. Nor is this met by the Modernist conception of an original germ, preserved intact within the changing envelope of dogmatic formulæ. No new formula that the Church may use does any more than bring out what has already been in some way, at least implicitly, involved in the original Apostolic teaching. We are not concerned, therefore, to inquire into the mode of the divine action upon the minds of the first recipients of revelation destined to be communicated to others. Suffice it to say that, for a *public* revelation, it was necessary that the communication of supernatural truth should awaken concepts and judgments in the minds of those who received it, and that those concepts and judgments should be capable not only of intellectual expression in the mind, but of formulation in spoken words. Only thus could prophets and Apostles convey their teaching. It is not claimed that any human concepts or any human words can exhaustively and comprehensively express divine things; but it is claimed that they convey real and absolute truth; that they give, by way of analogies drawn from those things of which we have experience, real and correct information about the supernatural world. In other words, by means of the concepts and judgments communicated by revelation we gain a true apprehension of things divine, correct and sufficient for the purposes of salvation, though far below the wonderful reality that shall break upon our vision unveiled in the heavenly country.

---

[14] *Op. cit.*, p. 214.

[15] *Ibid.*

Modernists are fond of insisting (ad nauseam) that the dogmas of faith are not truths that have come down from heaven. Thus the Modernist Loisy writes: "Les conceptions que l'Eglise present comme les dogmes révélés ne sont pas des vérités tombeés du ciel et gardées par la tradition dans la forme précise où elles ont paru d'abord. L'historien y voit l'interpretation de faits religieux, acquise par un laborieux effort de la penseé theologique."[17]

---

[16] "The Wayfarer's Vision," p. 31.

[17] See "Autour d'un Petit Livre," p. 189. Compare also Proposition 22, condemned in the Decree ("amentabile" of the Holy Office, July 3, 1907): "Dogmata quae Ecclesia perhibet tanquam revelata, non sunt veritates e coelo delapsae, sed sunt interpretatio quaedam factorum religiosorum quam humana meus laborioso conatu sibi comparavit."

It is true, as has been remarked already, that the wording, the phraseology of later definitions or authoritative enunciations of Catholic dogma are not identical in form with the first utterances of truth by Christ and the Holy Apostles—but who shall say that, from the very first, in the most primitive stage of Christian doctrine —that is in the time and upon the lips of Our Divine Lord Himself —we do not find "dogmas," assertions of divine truths and facts which, had the knowledge of them not come from on high, we never could have known at all? "I and my Father are one," "the Word was made flesh," "this is My body: this is My blood," "thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church"—are not these dogmas, and do they not come from the lips of Him who was sent by the Father? There is an ambiguity in this Modernist contention which was exposed long ago by Cardinal, then Dr. Newman. He points out that whereas the words and the elementary simple concepts of which any dogmatic assertion or judgment must be composed are of the earth, yet the judgment itself, the complex concept formed by the combination of simple concepts into an assertion, is new, and that herein consists the truth revealed by God. "How," he asks, "should anything of this world convey ideas which are beyond and above this world? How can teaching and intercourse, how can human words, how can earthly images convey to the mind an idea of the Invisible? They cannot rise above themselves. They can suggest no idea but what is resolvable into ideas natural and earthly. The words "Person," "Substance," "Consubstantial," 'Generation," "Procession," "Incarnation," "Taking of the manhood into God" and the like have either a very abject and human meaning or none at all. . . . We speak, indeed, of material objects freely, because our senses reveal them to us apart from our words; but as to these ideas about heavenly things, we learn them from words, yet (it seems) we are to say what we, without words, conceive of them, as if words could convey what they do not contain. It follows that our anathemas, our controversies, our struggles, our sufferings, are merely about the poor ideas conveyed to us in certain figures of speech."[18]

A scholastic theologian would have answered the difficulty chiefly by an exposition of the principles of analogy; the future Cardinal appeals (and rightly), first to the power of divine grace, or, as we should say, the gift of faith, which enables the mind to grasp divine things, and then adds—what is to our present purpose: "Again, the various terms and figures which are used (*e. g.*) in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity or the Incarnation, surely may by their combination create ideas which will be altogether new, though they are still of an earthly character."[19]

---

[18] "Oxford University Sermons," Sermon XV., on the "Theory of Developments in Religious Doctrine." Ed. 1900, pp. 338-339.

Treating of this Modernist contention that dogmas have not "dropped from heaven," a modern scholastic,[20] making the same distinction, writes as follows:

"Certe, in dogmatibus prout nobis proponuntur, sunt primo verba; sunt deinde conceptus seorsum accepti, iique vel simplices et incomplexi, vel complexi et e simplicibus resultantes; est denique nexus quo componuntur conceptus in judicio. Quid jam volunt evolutionistac nostri, quando veritates dogmaticas dicunt non e caelo delapsas? Quod non sint e caelo delapsa verba? Id quidem concedimus. . . . Quod non sint e coelo delapsi conceptus? Id quoque indubitanter damus, si sermo sit de conceptibus primis atque elementaribus, quia ejusmodi notiones, si apud nos non fuissent, debuissent venire in nobis, ad hoc ut nobis intelligibilis fieret sermo revelationis, aut per infusionem miraculosam, aut per hoc quod objecta nova praesentata forent nostris sensibus et nostrae intuitioni. Neutrum autem ex his praestet revelatio. . . . Praesupponebat ergo conceptus nostros, saltem primos et elementares. Nam de complexis non eadem omnino est ratio, quia nihil vetat quominus novos quosdam revelatio altulerit, quos ratio nostra alias non habuisset, sicut patet de his nominibus, 'consubstantialis,' 'Deipara,' 'transubstantiatio,' etc., in quibus *elementa complexionis erant communiter nota apud nos, complexio autem ipso, non ita.*" (Italics mine.)

Again: "Ostensum . .. est, quod dogma supernaturale iisdem ac scientia naturalis utituo elementis ad formandum suos proprios conceptus, suaque propria judicia. Veritas est in *nova, compositione* idearum (Italics mine), etsi ideae componentes sint antiquae; nova etiam est idea complexiva multarum notarum, etsi notae ipsae sint vulgares. . . . Revelata est ergo compositio conceptuum, non dati sunt, aut dari debuerunt de novo conceptus primi."[21]

We may rightly decline, then, to be led away by the Modernist sneer at dogmas that have "fallen from heaven." We have no need of the distinction between "dogmas" strictly so called, represented by the "secondary formulæ" of our new teachers, and the "primary formulæ," or utterances of primitive saints and seers and of Our Blessed Lord Himself. Whilst recognizing that, in the simple and fervent expressions of the inspired writings, as also in the sayings of saints in every age, there is an element calculated specially to impress and to arouse devotion, we reverence the utterances of the Church as also oracles of God, faithfully conveying to us the same truths spoken by the prophets, by Jesus Christ and His Apostles, and repeated by every saint and man of God who has been moved by one and the same Spirit who distributes diversities of gifts for the edification of the Church.

---

[19] *Ibid*, p. 339.

[20] Fr. Billot, S. J., "De Traditione," Cap. II., Sec. 2.

[21] *Ibid*, Sec. 3.

Development, in the Catholic view, begins with that body of divinely revealed analogical concepts, combined into judgments or dogmatic assertions (of which many have been at first, and many may be as yet implicit only), which we call the *Depositum fidei.*

This Deposit existed at the beginning partly in words—the words of Holy Scripture, the words, doubtless soon fixed in a certain "stereotyped" form, of the Apostolical teaching and catechetical instruction. Also in liturgical actions, Apostolic practices, fixed forms of prayer and praise. It lay in the common consciousness of the Church at large, in the minds of the Christian people; it was directed and controlled from the first by the Holy Spirit acting through the Apostles and their successors in the office of infallibly expounding the faith. It was much more, from the very beginning, than a vague "germ" or "principle." It spread out before the minds of Christians a wealth of truth concerning God and man and the realm of grace and glory that shall give scope as long as the world lasts to wondering contemplation and reverent endeavor to penetrate more and more its inexhaustible riches.

It has been recognized from the earliest ages that not all the truths actually contained in and possible to be recognized in this Deposit are found therein in the same way. Hence scholastic theologians, following the Fathers, have stated a truth which I will give in the words of Father Billot: "Quod doctrina traditionis, etsi sit semper eadem, non ideo est semper eodem modo enucleata, limata, et expolita, sed accipit processa temporis, occasione praescribim insurgentium haeresum, plus evidentiae, plus luminis, plus praecisionis. Et quod, generatum loquendo, tres sunt quoad singula dogmata status distinguendi: status simplicis fidei, status explicationis perfectae, et status intermedius, quando incipiebat transitus a simplici fide ad speculationem theologicam, et pro multiplici initiorum difficultate, adhuc erant expositiones minus exactae, et modi loquendi quandoque ambigui."[22]

Again the same theologian writes: "Haec est regula in theologia, et solutio difficultatum circa traditionem, cujus doctrina semper quidem eadem est, at non semper eodem modo clara et expressa. Accipit enim cum tempore, ut Lirinensis ait, *evidentiam, lucem, distinctionem* seu praecisionem, idque principaliter occasione haeresum de novo insurgentium. Nam ipsae sunt haeresas, quae potissimum necessitatem creant scrutandi dogmata, enucleandi conceptus quibus constant, distincte proponendi notas quae in eis sunt discernendae, sejungendi modos intelligendi et significandi ab ipsis rebus intellectis et significatis, inveniendi etiam vocabula idonea quibus res altissimae apte exprimantur, etc."[23]

---

[22] *Op. cit.*, Cap. I., Sec. 2.

In the same sense Cardinal Franzelin[24] lays down: "Affirmandum est, posse esse et esse in deposito objectivae revelationis veritates quae 1° non semper et ubique continerentur explicite in Catholico intellectu et in manifesta praedicatione ecclesiastica; quae ideo 2° aliquo tempore intra ipsos fines Ecclesiae citra crimen haeresis in controversiam vocarentur; adeoque 3° posse quasdam veritates revelatas aliquo tempore esse obscurae, nunquam tamen posse obscurari ita ut adversus eas praevaleat oppositus et negans consensus."

We have in these scholastic theses the main outline of the doctrinal development recognized by Catholic teaching. It may be summed up as consisting in a threefold process; first, in the clearer recognition and more definite understanding of the contents and implications of dogmas which have been *explicitly* taught and believed, indeed, from the beginning, yet with a more or less confused apprehension of their full significance. Thus from the beginning the Church held and taught explicitly the dogmas of the Blessed Trinity and of the divinity of Our Lord Jesus Christ; yet it was only in the course of centuries that the truths involved in these doctrines—such as the Unity of nature, the Trinity of Persons, the Consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, the Procession of the Holy Ghost and so forth—were clearly, separately and distinctly set forth in the scheme of Catholic doctrine. Secondly, the Church has explicitly enunciated, in the course of the centuries, what was at first *implicitly* contained in the Deposit; and this either by bringing out one by one and separately the constitutive elements of a complex dogma or by enunciating particular propositions contained in a general proposition. Thus, for instance, the doctrines of the two wills and operations in Christ, of the immunity of the Blessed Virgin Mary from all sin, original or actual, the prerogatives of the Roman Pontiff, are constitutive elements of complex dogmas, namely, of the doctrines that Christ is true God and true man, that the Blessed Virgin was full of grace and associated with her Son in the work of our redemption, that Peter is the rock upon which the Church is built and the shepherd of the whole flock of Christ. So again, the doctrines of the necessity of grace for the beginning of faith and for final perseverance are particular propositions contained under the general dogma of the necessity of grace for every "salutary" work.

---

[23] *Ibid.*

[24] "De Trad.," Thesis XXIII.

Lastly, development involves the proposition in words and in oral teaching of truths formerly conveyed rather by recognized custom and practice (of which we have a notable instance in the case of the doctrine of the validity [servatis servandis] of baptism by heretics) than by verbal enunciation.

In this process of "explicitation," while the action of the hierarchy, *the Ecclesia docens,* under the direction of the Holy Spirit, is the chief efficient cause, a human element has its place. Of this Cardinal Franzelin writes: "Quae quamvis ita sint (i. e., the office of the hierarchy as the 'developing authority' acting with the *charisma* of the Holy Spirit), hoc tamen promissum et *ordinarium* charisma Spiritus veritatis non est per novam revelationem . . . ; sed est per assistentiam et per directionem Spiritus Sancti ita ut elementum humanum inquisitionis, industriae, doctrinae acquisitae non excludatur, sed immo supponatur. Possumus quoad hanc rem distinguere tria, *occasionem, preparationem, ultimam conclusionem* explicationis, clarioris propositionis, strictioris definitionis dogmatum. Occasionem externam[25] frequentissime praebent controversiae exortae, errores, haereses. . . . 'Ex haereticis asserta est Catholica,' inquit Augustinus, . . . 'et ex his qui male sentiunt, probati sunt qui bene sentiunt. Multa enim *latebant in Scripturis;* et cum praecisi sunt haeretici, quaestionibus agitaverunt Ecclesiam Dei: aperta sunt, quae latebant, et intellecta est voluntas Dei.'

"*Praeparatio* interna explicationis varia est et latissime patet. Ad elementum humanum hic sine dubio praeter alia pertinet scientia acquisita disciplinarum sacrarum, studium Scripturarum, operum ss. Patrum et universim monumentorum ecclesiasticorum, liturgiae, rituum, consuetudinum ecclesiasticarum, theologiae denique universae, in quibus omnibus subsidium disciplinarum etiam mere rationalium et humanarum deesse non potest. Tota denique haec opera et industria considerari debet subdita et subserviens auctoritate ac vigilantiae magisterii authentici. Ab non sola scientia constituitur hoc elementum praeparationis, quod dicimus humanum; sed alia sunt quam plurima rerum ac eventuum, et totius vitae christianae adjuncta, ad populum christianum et ad universam Ecclesiam pertinentia, quibus explicatio, illustratio, distinctior definitio dogmatum praeparari potest. Non opponimus igitur hoc loco *humanum divino* sicut distinguitur *natura* et *gratia;* sed *elementum humanum* dicimus tam naturalem quam supernaturalem *dispositionem ac cooperationem ex parte hominum,* quam Spiritus Sanctus sua providentia et assistentia moderatur ac dirigit ad fidei explicationem, definitionem ac defensionem. Unde elementum istud quod dicimus *humanum,* quatenus pertinet ad praeparationem explicationis, considerari debet semper sub speciali providentia et directione Spiritus Sancti; adeoque in ipsa praeparatione humanum a divino distingui, non tamen separari potest. . . . *Conclusionem* explicationis appellamus ipsam authenticam propositionem, quando jam dogma explicite, clare, diserte proponitur credendum; sive id fiat per solemnem definitionem, sive per consensum universalem praedicationis ecclesiasticae aliter praevalentis. . . . Elementum humanum potest quidem esse varium in diversis aetatibus; sed infallibilitas propositionis et definitionis tota nititur in promissa assistentia Spiritus Sancti, non vero pendet a perfectione elementi humani, diligentiae, inquisitionis, theologicae scientiae per se spectatae."[26]

---

[25] Notice the epithet "externam." Modernists make the clash of varying opinions, of truth and error, an intrinsic and necessary cause of dogmatic evolution.

It may be said that, so far, we have not penetrated very deeply into the inner nature of the process of dogmatic development. What has been said hitherto gives us rather the results than the inner working of the process. It is here, surely, that the Modernist has fallen into the error of too much rationalizing. In his anxiety to explain the evolution of dogmas he has eviscerated the process of its divine and supernatural element. He has made it a purely human process, whereas it is partly human, partly divine. Were it simply human, it is to be doubted whether the records of history ever would suffice to give us sufficient data for that complete reconstruction of Catholic life and thought from the beginning till now which would enable us so closely to follow psychological operations in many minds spread over many centuries as to trace out clearly and completely the development of each and every doctrine of our holy religion. To ask this of history is to ask more than history *by itself* can perform. A broad view of history, as Newman has shown in so masterly a way in the Essay on Development, overwhelmingly proves that modern "Roman" dogmas are the only true representatives of primitive teaching, and does this in such manner as to assure us that historical research, however far it may go in the future, will not belie that fact. But, however far research may be carried, history will not reveal every detail of development from the beginning. Hence it is that Catholic tradition, the tradition which is sufficient for a proximate rule of faith, the tradition which assures us that the criterion of past teaching is the living voice of the Church of to-day, is not to be looked upon as merely a collection of documents, nor considered *merely* in its historical aspect as a continuous handing down of doctrines from generation to generation, but as adding to these natural characteristics a supernatural element of whose action they form the basis—and that supernatural element is the directive and preservative operation of the Holy Ghost, who animates the mystical body of Christ, and who was promised to the Church to lead her into all truth. For this reason, too, the incapacity of history by itself to assure us of legitimate developments—Cardinal Newman saw the need of a *developing authority*. "It has now been made probable," he writes, "that developments of Christianity were but natural, as time went on, and were to be expected. . . . The next question is, *what* are they? and to a theologian, who could take a general view and also possessed an intimate and minute knowledge of its history, they would doubtless on the whole be easily distinguishable by their own characters and require no foreign aid to point them out, no external authority to ratify them. But it is difficult to say who is in this position.[27] . . . It can hardly be maintained that in matter of fact a true development carries with it always its own certainty even to the learned, or that history, past or present, is secure from the possibility of a variety of interpretations."[28] Again: "Tests, it is true, for ascertaining the correctness of developments in general may be drawn out, as I shall show in the sequel; but they are insufficient for the guidance of individuals in the case of so large and complicated a problem as Christianity, though they may aid our inquiries and support our conclusions in particular points. They are of a scientific and controversial, not of a practical character, and are instruments rather than warrants of a right decision. . . . While, then, on the one hand, it is probable that some means will be granted for ascertaining the legitimate and true developments of revelation, it appears, on the other, that these means must of necessity be external to the developments themselves.[29] The process of development, then, contains an element of mystery—the nature of the divine directive and protective action upon the Church. We know that it is not in the nature of inspiration or the revelation of new truths; that it is rightly described as an "assistentia;" but being a divine operation, it is mysterious and not capable of rationalizing treatment pure and simple.

---

[26] "De Trad.," p. 278.

Taking this into consideration, as well as the complexity of the human element in development, we may well doubt whether the efforts of historical investigation will carry us very much further than theologians have gone already; and the event may prove that old-fashioned views are nearer the truth, after all, than the bolder theories of the modern historical method.

---

[27] Should we not say rather that it is impossible for any one to be in this position?

[28] "Essay in Development." Ed. 1888. Longmans, London, p. 76.

[29] *Op. cit.*, p. 78.

The Modernist gives an altogether unduly preponderating influence in his theory of dogmatic evolution to the human element recognized by Catholic theologians in the process of doctrinal development. Where the latter see only *occasions* of and *preparation for* the action of the *Ecclesia docens* in the actual carrying forward of developments under the influence of the divine *assistentia,* the Modernist sees self-sufficient and sole causes of a purely naturalistic evolution already sufficiently described. This has drawn down repeated condemnation from Pius X. in the Encyclical. As we learn from the eminent theologians quoted above, heresies, theological study, disputes, the contemplations of saints, the whole life of prayer and religion that pulsates through the Church, and, as Cardinal Franzelin says, the events of the Church's history are —also under the providential action and guidance of the same Holy Spirit—either the occasions of or the preparation for the action of the "developing authority" demanded by Cardinal Newman in his famous essay. To these is to be added, according to the same high and unexceptionable authorities, the very nature of Catholic doctrine itself,[30] and we may surely suppose that, had heresies never arisen, the very depth and richness of the truth would have led to development, as indeed has been the case.[31] But neither this loving contemplation, nor theological or secular study, nor the events of history, nor the play of the various forces of human life must be looked at as producing a naturalistic evolution in the sphere of sacred truth. Divine in its origin and in its nature, conveyed to and held in human minds by the medium, it is true, of human concepts—since omne cognitum est in cognoscente secundum modum cognoscentis—yet its divine origin and nature forbid us to treat it or its development as if both were merely human. Hence, though with Franzelin we reject in the process of its tradition and explication such psychological miracles as would deprive the human element therein of its human characteristics, we may not reject that supernatural element in the process which bids us, as in all questions of the coöperation of divine and human action, not carry our rationalizing into the sphere of things secret and divine. For Catholic theologians, the chief *nodus* of the question of development lies in determining the precise nature of the passage of a doctrine from the *implicit* to the *explicit* state. What kind of implicit inclusion in the Deposit of faith is sufficient to make a doctrine the potential object of explicitation or "development," and, therefore, should its development ever proceed so far, definable as an article of faith, or capable of so permeating Catholic thought with the idea of its revealed truthfulness as to make it the matter of universal belief and of teaching by the ordinary magisterium of the Church?

---

[30] Thus Hurter writes ("Compend. Theol.," Vol. I., p. 169, ed. 1896): "Veritates revelatae non sunt lapidum instar, sed seminum instar, et quo altiores, eoque fecundiores conclusionumque feraciores; inde vero intellectus humanus non se habet in percipiendis hisce veritatibus mere passive, sed agri instar peus minusua fertilis ad semina recepta excolenda ab evolvenda," etc.

[31] The Encyclical condemns the contention that "the progress of dogma is due *chiefly* (italics mine) to the fad that obstacles to the faith have to be surmounted, enemies have to be vanquished and objections have to be refuted." See my note in the first paper in this series (p. 000) on this passage of the Encyclical. Moreover, as was pointed out in the note, the Modernist idea of the conflict between truth and error and of the endeavor to penetrate the mysteries of faith more deeply is altogether peculiar. To the Modernist heresies are not an evil, but a necessary and inevitable part of the play of opposing forces by which dogmatic evolution proceeds; while "penetrating the mysteries of faith," is not a reverent and devout study, but a process of rationalizing which makes the most sacred dogmas, such as that of the Divinity of Christ, the result of a purely natural evolution of the thought of men.

There is a school of theologians who teach that a distinction should be made between truths that are the object of "divine faith" and those that are the object of what is termed "ecclesiastical faith." These two kinds of faith are specified by their motives. The motive of divine faith is the authority of God revealing; the motive of ecclesiastical faith is the infallibility of the Church, defining, in this case, truths that are considered to be not directly revealed, but so connected with revealed truths that the latter could not be safeguarded without them. According to this theory, only such doctrines as are contained *formaliter implicite* in the Deposit, or in some doctrine or complexus of doctrines *explicitly* held and taught, can ever become the object of divine faith; or, in other words, as being really revealed, can be the subject of *dogmatic* development strictly so called.[32] A doctrine is said to be *formaliter implicite* contained in an explicit doctrine when it is found therein as parts are found in a whole, *e. g.*, particular propositions in a universal or the component elements of a definition in the thing defined. Thus the proposition, "Christ has a body and a rational soul," is contained *formaliter implicite* in the proposition, "Christ is truly man;" and the proposition, "Titus was conceived in original sin," in this other, "All the natural descendants of Adam (except, by a special privilege, the Blessed Virgin Mary) are conceived in original sin." In such cases the mere exposition of the terms is sufficient to show that the one proposition contains the other. But a proposition may be only *virtualiter implicite* contained in an explicit proposition. In general, a proposition *virtualiter implicite* contained in another requires some kind of argumentative process, whether strictly logical or otherwise, beyond the mere exposition of the terms of the original proposition, to bring it out. At least it requires such process for its explicitation by merely human reasoning.[33]

---

[32] *E. g.*, Fr. Billot, S. J., "De virtutibus infusis." Rome, 1901. Thesis XII. "Nihil fide divina catholica credi potest aut poterit unquam, quod vel explicite, vel saltear 'formaliter implicite' in deposito ab Apostolis Ecclesiae tradito non contineatur."

Supposing a conclusion of this kind to be defined by the Church, the theologians of whom I speak say that, if it be defined as a *revealed* truth, it is to be believed, of course, with divine faith, and the Church's definition shows that, though we did not know it, the conclusion in question was really contained not only virtually, but *formally* in the Deposit. If such conclusion is *defined* as true, but not as *revealed*, it is to be held as *infallibly* true, but with ecclesiastical faith. Thus Father Christian Pesch, S. J., writes:[34] "Quid, si ecclesia diserte docet conclusionem admittendam esse? Duplex casus distinguendus est: Aut ecclesia definit conclusionem fide credendam esse; et in hoc casu conclusio fuit jam autea in se formaliter revelata, et hoc solummodo quoad nos non fuit sufficienter notum; per ecclesiae vero definitionem haec dubitatio tollitur. Aut conclusio non est formaliter revelata, et in hoc casu Ecclesia . . . solum docet doctrinam esse tenendam ut conclusionem theologicam infallibiliter certam. Talis conclusio pertinet ad fidem ecclesiasticam, non ad fidem divinam." And Father Billot writes:[35] "Illud quod virtualiter tantum continetur in explicite revelato, non est a Deo dictum, sed solum connectitur logice cum iis quae dixit Deus." The difficulty of this position lies in the fact that there are some dogmas, defined as of faith, concerning which it would not be an easy task to show how they are contained *formaliter implicite* in any explicit doctrine or series of doctrines. Such are, for instance, the dogma teaching that the soul is the "substantial form" of the body,[36] or the dogma relative to the number of the sacraments. If, again, the mere exposition of terms is sufficient, it is hard to understand how the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception could have been called into question. In this case what was once only a pious belief has become an article of faith, and, to the great joy of the Catholic people, is proclaimed as a truth revealed by God. Hence it is that other theologians have rejected the distinction between divine and "ecclesiastical" faith.[37]

---

[33] Some theologians—*e. g.*, Fr. Billot (*loc. cit.*)—appear to admit only theological conclusions, in which a naturally known and unrevealed premiss intervenes, into the category of truths "virtualiter implicite" contained in others. The view here taken is wider. It supposes that there are other than strictly logical processes by which a truth may become explicit. processes that, *under the divine influence working in dogmatic development*, though they may not be logically apparent (while at the same time they cannot, of course, evidently contradict right reason), may, and do, bring about the explicitation of what is not *evidently* contained formally in the *depositum fidei*. In this case the definition of the Church gives us the certainty of such inclusion in the Deposit.

[34] "De Virtutibus," Freiburg, 1898, p. 102.

[35] *Op. cit.*, p. 255.

[36] Denzinger, No. 409. He who denies this teaching, says the Council of Vienna, which defined it, "tanquam *haereticus* sit consendus."

For them, *dogmatic* progress is not restricted to the explicitation of what is *evidently formaliter implicite* contained in the Deposit of faith. They will not allow that progress of the apparently "virtualiter" implicit belongs only to the sphere of a "theological" development which cannot issue on "dogmas," but only in conclusions, rendered infallible, indeed, by the Church's definition, but in no sense to be regarded as pertaining to the category of revealed truths. They consider that facts require a greater extension of strictly dogmatic development than the narrower view will permit. They hold, with Franzelin, that "Deus per Ecclesiam tanquam per factum suum, seu tanquam per verba realia conjuncta cum suis verbis formalibus, loquatur omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem saeculi.[38] They refuse to see in the infallibility of the Church an authority that is merely human, though exercised under the divine assistentia which preserves it from error.

They hold, as Franzelin writes again, "talem testificationem (Ecclesiae) non esse humanam tantummodo, sed esse locutionem Spiritus Sancti per Ecclesiam, dum locutio Spiritus Sancti olim facta per prophetas et Apostolos nunc eadem proponitur a Spiritu Sancto per Ecclesiam."[39] Seeing in the Church the mystical body of Christ, morally one with Him, they hear in her voice the voice of God, and admit, what the opposing school denies, that "testimonium Ecclesiae, non quatenus est hominum, sed quatenus est Spiritus Sancti, pertinet ad formale motivum fidei."[40] Nor does this doctrine suppose any power in the Church of producing new revelations, for, as an eminent theologian points out,[41] "Quando theologi aliqui decere solent non dari in Ecclesia novo dogmata de novo credenda, plus dicere nolunt, quam quod nihil incipiat de novo esse de fide formaliter et explicite, quod prius non fuerit de fide radicaliter, implicite et *virtualiter,* quatenus nimerum Ecclesia ea solum definit explicite credenda, *quae per assistentiam Spiritus*

---

[37] *E. g.*, Schiffini, S. J., "De Virtutibus infusis." Freiburg, 1904. Thesis XVIII., p. 218. "Fides illa, quam nonnulli ecclesiasticam dixerunt, utpote quae proxime nititur infallibili Ecclesiasticae magisterio, sive in se, sive in suo objecto spectetur, a fide infusa et Theologica non est distinguenda."

[38] "De Trad.," Appendix, Cap. V., p. 639.

[39] *Op. cit.*, pp. 652-653.

[40] *Ibid.*

[41] Haunaldus apud Schiffini, *op. cit*, p. 146.

Sancti cognoscit contineri virtute in objecto jam ante formaliter revelato. Et hoc sensu (inquit recte Card. Pallavicino) verum est effatum commune: 'Non datur nova revelatio in Ecclesia.' Significat enim non dari revelationem, quae non sit complementum revelationis praeteritae. Non tamen significat non dari novam locutionem quamdam Dei, quae sit explicatio et complementum revelationis antiquae, ita ut reddatur nobis de fide id, quod ante non erat de fide, cum scilicet Deus per Ecclesiam explicat de quibusnam objectis particularibus locutus sit quando edidit revelationes universales. Hinc ulterius inferunt doctores discrimen inter doctrinam Conciliorum et Scripturam canonicam. Nam sciptor canonicus scribit independenter a revelatione alia praecedente alteri facta: Ecclesia autem in Conciliis *evolvit revelationes ante factas,* et ideo non potest condere novam Scripturam canonicam propter defectam revelationis novae." (Italics mine.) Hence Schiffini lays down this thesis: "Ecclesiae magisterium dogmata divinitus revelata proponentis et explicantis, ac facta supernaturalia, quibus divina ipsius missio credibilis redditur, non solum manifestant locutionem jam factam, sed sunt etiam complementum integrate ejusdem divinae locutionis praeteritae, prout ad nos et ad singulas in particulari directae ac derivatae."[42] On these principles, while not admitting that a "theological conclusion" in the strict sense of the term, that is, a conclusion drawn from one revealed premiss and one premiss resting on natural reason, is "dictum a Deo" and therefore part of the Deposit, we may believe—and the belief will account for strictly *dogmatic* developments which otherwise it would be difficult to account for—that the Church has power, as carrying on the divine "locutio" under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, to discern in the Deposit and to define as articles of divine and Catholic faith truths which human reason of itself would fail to recognize as "formally" contained therein, or at least could give only probable grounds for supposing them to be so contained. In this case, as we have seen an opponent of these views admit,[43] the definition of the Church gives us the certainty of such inclusion in the Deposit, where merely human investigation would not be competent to come to any compelling decision; and such definition is, in truth, an "explication" of revealed doctrine. If we take this view, we are able to recognize a real progress in Catholic dogma, while those who hold the opposite theory would seem to nullify to a great extent very much of what has been said by theologians of note and by Fathers of the Church concerning the *profectus fidelium in fide,* and scarcely to acknowledge that doctrinal progress which, described by St. Vincent of

---

[42] *Op. cit.*, p. 144.

[43] See Fr. Pesch, quoted above.

Lerins and commended in that father's own words by the Vatican Council, has again been insisted upon in the same words by our Holy Father Pius X. Be that as it may—and it is a matter for further development of the question of development itself—Catholics know that the Church's living tradition can never go astray nor become corrupt; that it is the faithful echo of past ages; that what the Church says now is not different from what she has said, in other words, perhaps, and with less fulness and explicitness, yet with no different meaning. They know that development, whether it shall be found ultimately to mean more or less than it has been taken to mean—in the opinion, that is, of Catholic theologians arguing within the limits of what is allowable, yet must always be, not any change or alteration of the original Deposit, but its legitimate exposition "in eodem dogmate, eodem sensu, eademque sententia."

H. G. HUGHES.

Norwich, England.

CHURCH AND STATE.

VIII.

THE PONTIFICATE OF GREGORY THE GREAT.

THE pontificate of Pope Vigilius, not to speak of that of his martyred predecessor, Silverius, must have been to the contemporary clergy of the Roman Church an impressive object lesson in the drawbacks of imperial rule in Italy, Romans as they were, and therefore thoroughly loyal to the ideal of a world-empire; yet, whether they viewed the matter as ecclesiastics or as citizens, the restoration under Justinian was far from proving as satisfactory as they might reasonably have expected. For, as we have seen in a previous paper, the most evident result of this Emperor's intermeddling in the concerns of the Church was that, at the end of his reign, conditions were worse than when he ascended the throne. He had even succeeded in making a breach in the solid West; the Istrian schism, which dragged along for half a century after the death of Vigilius, was an achievement for which he alone was primarily responsible. But even more serious was the pretension of this crowned theologian either to nominate directly or to reserve to himself and his successors the right of confirming the Pope. How Vigilius reached the Pontifical throne has been told; the same principle, without the accompanying violence, was followed in the selection of his successor, Pelagius I. Pelagius, at one time an uncompromising opponent of Justinian's religious policy, eventually yielded to the sort of persuasions characteristic of Byzantium and received his reward. The Emperor had even contemplated placing him on the Papal throne during the lifetime of Vigilius. "Do you wish to receive Vigilius, who *was* your Pope?" he inquired of the Roman delegates who petitioned for the return of the imprisoned Pontiff. "But if not, here is your Archdeacon Pelagius, and my hand will be with you." But the delegates did not want Pelagius, at least while his and their master was still living. They added, however, that "when the Lord shall take him (Vigilius) from this world, then *by your command* let the Archdeacon Pelagius be given us."[1] Thus was established a precedent which, had not circumstances interfered, would have reduced the Popes to the status of the Patriarchs of Constantinople. The successors of Pelagius during the period of Byzantine domination in Italy were confirmed, at first by the Emperor, and from the reign of Constantine Pogonatus (668-685) by the Exarch, the sum of twenty pounds of gold ($4,000) being exacted for the favor.

Nor were the hopes of the Romans better realized in the civil order by their reunion with the empire. The long-drawn-out war of conquest begun by Belisarius and completed by Narses brought great misery in its train. But this might have been borne with equanimity had it been the precursor of a normal condition of prosperity under a strong and just government. Such good fortune, however, was not just then to befall Italy. The exarchate was never able to do more than maintain a precarious foothold, whereas, on the other hand the Byzantine officials by whom it was administered were passed masters in the gentle art of graft. All the excellent laws of Justinian enacted for the protection of the citizens proved futile. Even the great Narses was believed to have yielded to temptation. At all events, according to the Liber Pontificalis, during the pontificate of John III. (561-574), the Romans complained to the Emperor Justin II. that they had fared better under the Goths than under the Greeks, "since where Narses the eunuch rules he subjects us to slavery, and the most pious prince is unaware of this."[2] The complainants added that unless the Emperor delivered them from the oppression to which they were subjected they would "serve the barbarians." When the accusations made against him were brought to the notice of Narses, he replied: "If I have done evil to the Romans, I shall find myself in evil plight." Then, in revenge, the great soldier is said to have written to the Lombards, at that time in Pannonia, inviting them to come and take possession of Italy.

---

[1] Liber Potificalis, I., 299.

[2] L. P., I., 305.

The strict accuracy of this explanation of the coming of the Lombards may reasonably be questioned.[3] In the pontificate of Vigilius the Romans had already shown symptoms of a quality they were often in the future to manifest: ingratitude, and consequently their charge against Narses may largely be discounted. What is certain is that Narses was deprived of the Governorship of Italy, a fact which in itself may have been sufficient encouragement to the Lombards to invade a land the attractions of which were already well known to them.

The heterogeneous mass of barbarians designated Lombards, of Germanic stock, set out from Pannonia on their march to Italy, April 2, 568. The invaders entered the land of their dreams through a pass in the Julian Alps, and in the following three years, before the death (572) of their King Alboin, overran the greater part of the peninsula. Thus were lost forever most of the hard-won conquests of the generals of Justinian, and nothing remained to the empire in Italy save Ravenna, the Pentapolis, Perugia, Rome, with a strip of territory adjacent to the capital, Naples, and a few other cities on the seacoast or approachable by navigable rivers. A terrible pestilence which almost depopulated the Province of Liguria contributed in some degree to the success of the invaders, and this was followed in 570 by a famine which still further deprived the imperial forces of means of resistance.

But the victorious Lombard chief was not long destined to enjoy the fruits of his warlike labors; Alboin died by the hand of an assassin in the spring of 572. His successor, King Cleph, also perished by assassination in 574, after which, for ten years, no king was chosen; the various chiefs, under the title of dukes, governed the territories previously assigned them. This arrangement, however, proved a failure, and in 584 a king was chosen in the person of Authari, son of Cleph, who, in addition to his own barbarian patronymic, took the Roman name of Flavius.

Flavius Authari during his short reign of about five years added somewhat by his conquests in Southern Italy to the territory already in the hands of the Lombards. But perhaps the most important act of his reign was his marriage with the Bavarian Catholic Princess, Theodolinda—the Lombards were, at least nominally, Arians. So popular did this young Queen become that after the death without issue (589) of her royal consort she was allowed to name his successor. Her choice fell upon Agilulf, Duke of Turin, who became her second husband.

Meanwhile the Emperors at Constantinople, Justin II. and Tiberius II., had taken no effectual steps to stop the progress of the new conquerors of Italy. The Governor Longinus, who succeeded Narses, had proved wholly unequal to his task and was recalled (585). His successor, Smaragdus, the first of the Byzantine governors to bear the title of Exarch, was an able general, who, with the aid of the Franks, gained some partial successes over the Lombards. Yet, when recalled in 589, so indifferently had he been supported, the situation of the exarchate was if anything worse than at the time of his arrival. This very year of his recall destructive floods in Northern Italy caused incalculable injury to the already distressed people. Farms were washed away by the impetuous torrents, and the houses which escaped destruction were filled with corpses. In Rome the Tiber overflowed its banks, inundating the lower portions of the city. Worse still, the granaries of the Church, upon which the Romans largely depended for their maintenance, were, with their contents, destroyed, thus making famine imminent. To add to their woes, the stagnant water produced a dreadful pestilence, which decimated the population, among its victims being the venerable Pontiff, Pelagius II. (579-590).

---

[3] See Hodgkin, "Italy and Her Invaders," Vol. V., C. II.

Such was the condition of things in Italy when the unanimous voice of the clergy and people of Rome called to the Chair of St. Peter a man destined to stand almost unrivaled in the long list of the Popes—St. Gregory the Great. A scion of the old Roman family of the Acilii, Gregory at an earlier period had filled the high office of Urban Prefect. In 575, however, to the surprise of his friends and acquaintances, he resigned this position and prepared to assume the monastic habit by disposing, with the exception of the ancestral palace on the Coelian, of his great estates. On six of these estates in Sicily he established monasteries; the remainder of his wealth was given to the poor. The palace on the Coelian, finally, was also erected into a monastery, he himself remaining therein as a simple monk

But the extraordinary ability of Gregory was not destined thus forever to be eclipsed, as he himself most ardently desired, behind the walls of a monastery. Pelagius II. soon called him forth to assume the office of Papal Nuncio (Apocrisiarius) at Constantinople. There he soon became a favorite with the imperial family, but his life was still almost as much governed by monastic rules as in the quiet of the cloister in Rome. He remained in Constantinople until 585 or 586, and then returned to the Coelian monastery, whence, to his consternation, he was called in 590 to assume the burden of the pontificate.

The Pope-elect tried hard to escape the great office the clergy and people of Rome would impose on him. Writing to the Emperor Maurice, he besought him in urgent terms to withhold the imperial assent to his election, but the Emperor, after several months' delay, confirmed the popular choice. Gregory then made a final attempt to avoid the grave burden of the Papacy, but while preparing for flight he was discovered, and, with the loving violence of which those ages afford more than one example, he was borne reluctantly to St. Peter's, where he received episcopal consecration.

Aside from his humility, which was the chief cause of Gregory's reluctance to become Pope, there were indeed reasons in abundance why a man with so high a sense of duty as he possessed should hesitate to accept so great responsibility at a critical moment. In the first place, his health was about as bad as it well could be, aside from mortal illness. The austerities of his monastic life had undermined his constitution to such an extent that chronic illness of the severest and most painful order was to be his lot during the fourteen years of his reign. A person of less strength of will would in similar circumstances have simply awaited death as a relief from an intolerable burden of physical pain. Yet the circumstances of the time were such as demanded on the Papal throne a man of the greatest energy. The "care of all the churches" alone would occupy most of the time at the disposal of the average man in vigorous health, but in the sixth century this was only one of many burdens which circumstances imposed upon the shoulders of a Pope. Unceasing wars with the Lombards, of the desultory, undecisive character most injurious to a country, brought famine and pestilence in their train, and only the Pope had the means and the will to alleviate the distress thus caused. The lack of a strong government at Ravenna, the seat of imperial rule, in the next place, compelled the Pope, as the most influential personage in Italy, frequently to assume grave civil responsibilities. And finally—by no means the least of his rsponsibilities—the Pope had to supervise the administration of the patrimonies, as they were called, of the Church scattered throughout the empire, and to distribute in accordance with established precedent their revenues for the benefit of the poor and the spread of religion.

PLAGUE AND FAMINE.

But Pope Gregory the Great was not the man once installed in office to remain inactive, and, therefore, we are not surprised to find that this chronic invalid during the term of his pontificate proved to be one of the most indefatigable workers who ever occupied the Chair of St. Peter. A summary sketch of the chief of his activities in temporal matters will consequently be of interest as showing the importance of the Papacy, in the civil order, in the closing years of the sixth century.

The first problem the newly elected Pope had to deal with was that of the pestilence and famine which were devastating Rome at the moment of his election. The story of the ending of the former of those afflictions is so well known that here it need only be referred to briefly. While still awaiting the Emperor's letter of confirmation, Gregory organized a series of processions, the objective point being the Basilica of St. Maria Maggiore, to implore the divine mercy in behalf of the distressed people. According to the beautiful legend of a later age,[4] in the course of one of these processions the Pope saw on the summit of the mausoleum of Hadrian the Archangel Michael, with a flaming sword, which he was in the act of returning to its sheath, a sign that God had heard the prayers of the petitioners and that the plague was about to cease.

But no sooner was this matter disposed of than the Pope was called upon to deal with the question of the terrible famine that afflicted the land. From all parts of Italy refugees flocked to Rome, first to escape the swords of the Lombards, and, secondly, to obtain wherewith to maintain existence. For these unhappy creatures were for the most part destitute, and as the Exarch was unable to render them assistance, this duty devolved upon the Pope. How effectually relief was administered under Gregory the Great we are informed by one of his biographers, John the Deacon. From the earliest Christian age Rome had been divided ecclesiastically into seven districts, each district in charge of a deacon, whose duty it was to relieve the needs of the poor. In the troubled days of Gregory's pontificate the headquarters of these districts, or "deaconries," were the chief centres where the poor of Rome and refugees from outside had their wants relieved. The homeless were further sheltered in the xenodochia, or guest houses, several of which, maintained by the Church, existed in Rome. Public distributions of corn from the granaries of the Church were made through the monasteries and basilicas also. The Pope himself participated directly in many works of charity. John the Deacon gives some interesting information as to how this was done. On the first day of each week, this author tells us, Gregory "distributed to the poor in general the same kind of produce which was collected from the rents; thus, corn in its season, and in their several seasons, wine, cheese, pulse, bacon or other wholesome flesh, fish and oil were most discreetly distributed by that father of the family of God. But pigments and other delicate articles of commerce were courteously offered by him to the nobles of the city, so that the Church came to be regarded as the warehouse of the whole community. To three thousand maids of God, whom the Greeks call *monastriae,* he gave fifteen pounds of gold (about $3,000) for bed furniture, and bestowed on them for their daily stipend eighty pounds ($16,000) annually. Moreover, every day he sent out by means of charioteers appointed for this purpose cooked rations to all the sick and infirm poor throughout the streets and lanes of the city. To those who had seen better days he would send a dish from his own table to be delivered at their doors with his apostolic blessing."[5]

---

[4] It is not recorded by Pope Gregory's biographers, Paul the Deacon and John the Deacon.

Another custom observed by Gregory was to assemble four times a year the officers of the Church, from the highest to the lowest, for the purpose of giving them a money present. John the Deacon's account of the procedure on such occasions is as follows: "Having assembled all the officials of the Church, the palace, the monasteries, the lesser churches, the cemeteries, the deaconries, the xenodochia for strangers in the city and the suburbs, he decided from the ledger (of Pope Gelasius), in accordance with which distributions are still made, how many *solidi* out of the above-named receipts in gold and silver should be given to each person, four times a year, namely, at Easter, on the birthday of the Apostles (June 29), on the birthday of St. Andrew (November 30) and his own birthday. At the first dawn of the day of Our Lord's Resurrection, in the Basilica of Vigilius, near which he lived, he gave to all Bishops, presbyters, deacons and other dignitaries of the Church an *aureus* (about $3) each, after bestowing on them the kiss of peace."

THE PATRIMONIES.

After reading these records of Gregory's munificence it is natural to inquire what were the sources of revenue that enabled the Pope thus to relieve the urgent needs of thousands of human beings, and this not once, but repeatedly throughout the fourteen years of his pontificate? The answer to this question is: the patrimonies of the Church. From the earliest period of her history the Roman Church enjoyed a splendid reputation for charity.[6] The Christians of the Eternal City were more than ordinarily generous, one consequence of which was that, in the course of centuries, great estates, known as patrimonies, were, from time to time, left to the Popes for the benefit of the poor and the advancement of religion. According to a modern estimate, the revenues from these estates in the time of Pope Gregory the Great amounted to not less than a million and a half dollars annually.

The great importance of the "patrimonies" for the well-being of the Romans, not to speak of others, during the long period of the invasions of Italy may easily be surmised from what we have seen above, and will be still more evident as we proceed. Fortunately, too, the principal patrimonies were in Sicily, which, owing to its insular position, was free from the danger of invasion. In Sicily the farmers of the Church were thus able to till the soil in peace, and the produce in even the most troubled days could be brought to Rome by sea.

---

[5] Vita Gregorii M., Cc. XXIV.-XXVIII.

[6] See "The Beginnings of the Temporal Power," *The Catholic University Bulletin,* January, 1904.

Some of the most interesting letters in the voluminous correspondence of Gregory the Great are devoted to the administration of the patrimonies. With all his serious cares, the kindly Pope never forgot the interests of the host of farmers and laborers who, on the estates of the Church, faithfully performed their humble, but, under the circumstances, very important duties. The following extracts from a letter written in the first year of his pontificate to the rector of the Sicilian estates will serve as an example of the attention given by the Pope to this subject, and at the same time bear witness to the high sense of justice of the distinguished writer. The person to whom the letter is addressed is the Sub-deacon Peter, who had but lately succeeded the Defensor Antoninus. Antoninus, it appears, had not, from Gregory's point of view, proved a successful administrator. Among other things, he had been accused of dealing harshly with the Church's farmers and of being sometimes more zealous than just in defense of the claims of the Church against neighboring farmers. The Pope directs Peter to inquire without delay into these complaints and to remedy any wrongs done by his predecessor. "It has come to my ears," he writes, "that during the past ten years, from the time of Antoninus the Defensor, many persons have suffered violence and wrong at the hands of the Roman Church, and that men openly complain that their borders have been invaded, their slaves enticed away, their movable property taken from them by the strong hand, with no pretense of judicial process. Pray in all these things let your experience exercise the most strenuous vigilance, and let this letter be your warrant for the restoration of whatever you find to have been violently taken away or wrongfully detained in the Church's name during those ten years; lest he who has suffered violence should be obliged to come to me and undertake the labor of so long a journey, in which case it could not be ascertained here before me whether or not he spoke the truth. Having regard, then, to the majesty of the Judge who is to come, restore all things that have been sinfully taken away, knowing that thou bringest great gain to me if thou gatherest (heavenly) reward rather than riches.

"We are informed also," the letter continues, "that what the greater part complain of is the loss of their slaves, saying that if any man's bondman, perhaps running away from his master, has declared himself to belong to the Church, the rectors of the Church have at once kept him as a bondman belonging to the Church, without any trial of the case, but supporting with a high hand the word of the slave. This displeases me as much as it is abhorrent to the judgment of truth. Wherefore, I desire thy experience to correct without delay whatever may have been found to have been so done; and it is also fit that any such slaves as are now kept in ecclesiastical possession, as they were taken away without trial, should be restored without trial; so that if Holy Church has any legitimate claim to them, their possessors may then be dislodged by regular process of law.

"Correct all these things with firmness, since thou wilt truly be a soldier of the Blessed Apostle Peter if in his cause thou keep guard over the truth, even without his receiving anything. But if thou seest anything that may justly be claimed as belonging to the Church, beware lest thou ever try to assert such claim by force, especially as I have established a decree forbidding under pain of anathema the affixing of notices of claim to any property, urban or rural, by our Church. But whatever may reasonably be claimed for the poor ought also to be defended by reason, lest a good thing being done in a manner that is not good, we be convicted before Almighty God even in what we justly seek. Moreover, I pray thee let noble laymen and the Glorious Praetor love thee for thy humility, not dread thee for thy pride. And yet, if by any chance thou knowest them to be doing any injustice to the indigent, turn thy humility at once into exaltation, so as to be always submissive to them when they do well, and opposed to them when they do ill."

THE POPE AND THE LOMBARDS.

But perhaps the greatest source of worry Pope Gregory the Great had to deal with was that from the Lombard conquerors of Italy. These barbarous pillagers were active during almost his entire pontificate, and on several occasions appeared before the walls of Rome itself. As little in the way of defense was possible, no inconsiderable part of the Pope's revenues was spent in buying off these invaders. "It is now seven years," Gregory wrote to the Empress Constantina, "that we have been living in this city amid the swords of the Lombards. How much is expended daily by this Church, that we may be able to live among them, is not to be told. But I briefly indicate that as in the regions of Ravenna the piety of my lords has a treasurer to defray the expenses of the first army of Italy, so also in this city I am their (the Lombards) treasurer." In other words, it cost the Pope as much to purchase some sort of immunity from Lombard incursions as it cost the Emperor to maintain his army in Italy.

Probably at no period since the invasion of Alaric was the general condition of the peninsula more deplorable than during the progress of the Lombard conquest. At the time of which we are now speaking the principal cities of Italy, Rome, Ravenna, Genoa and Naples, with a certain amount of territory adjacent to each, were held for the Emperor; all the rest of the land was controlled by the Lombards. Almost at any date during the two centuries after their first appearance these warlike invaders could have brought about its complete subjugation of the entire country; but they were never long enough united among themselves to effect this object. The Lombard dukes, among whom the territory won by the sword was divided, would not make the sacrifice which the circumstances demanded, and so eventually lost all because of their love of a selfish independence.

The imperialists, on their side, were, during the same period, just barely able to hold their own in the odds and ends of territory in their possession. And just as union would have completed the Lombard conquest, so, on the other hand, an imperial general of the calibre of Belisarius or Narses, with adequate military support, could at any moment have defeated the invaders in detail and expelled them from Italy or reduced them to subjection. But the emperors either could not or would not send a serious army to the West, and limited their efforts generally to the defense of the scattered domains of the exarchate.

But the most important factor in the political situation of Italy at this time was the Church, and the Church was unalterably opposed to the Lombards. It is true, indeed, that, from our point of view, the churchmen of that period had little cause to love their rulers at Constantinople, yet so deep was the affection of the Romans of old for the empire, that none of them would patiently entertain the idea of being governed by barbarians. The letters of the Popes bear frequent witness to their contempt and dislike of the "unspeakable" Lombards, as well as to their attachment to the empire, outside of which they regarded life as intolerable.

In accordance with these feelings, the Popes were unwearied in protesting against the indifference of Constantinople to the fate of Italy. Again and again do we find them imploring aid from the emperors, but this, when granted, was always inadequate. When Gregory the Great ascended the Papal throne the situation of the imperial territories was especially precarious. One of the earliest acts of the Lombard King Agilulf was to conclude a treaty of peace with the Frankish King Childebert, thus securing himself against outside interference in the pursuance of the advance policy on which he had determined. Agilulf's next move was to suppress the activities and bring under obedience three Lombard dukes in Northern Italy—which being effected, he was free to devote all his energies to war against the Exarch.

These plans of the Lombard ruler boded ill for Rome, which already was in serious straits, owing to the hostility of the Dukes of Spoleto and Benevento. The Duchy of Rome was then connected with Ravenna, the capital of the exarchate, by a narrow strip of territory, adjoining the Via Flaminia, which depended on the fortress of Perugia as its chief defense. Now, Spoleto, the capital of the duchy of this name, was in a position that constantly threatened this line of communication, which, if cut, would isolate Rome and place the Eternal City at the mercy of the Lombards. The southern frontier of the Roman duchy was at the same time threatened by the Duke of Benevento, who, by his command of the Via Appia, cut off communication with Constantinople by way of Brindisi. In 591 two new dukes ambitious of conquests acquired control in these Lombard duchies, Ariulf becoming Duke of Spoleto and Arichis Duke of Benevento. Thus the Romans were at the same time threatened from the north by the Lombard king and from the east and south by the two Lombard dukes.

Against these imminent dangers the Exarch Romanus had taken no steps for defense, so that on the Pope alone was thrown the burden of doing the best he could to hold the Roman duchy. The situation was not encouraging. The only soldiers in Rome were a handful of ill-paid troops under the command of the Magister Militum, Castorius, and an equally insignificant number of militia. And to make matters worse, the pestilence of the previous year (590) still continued and famine still threatened.

In the face of these grave difficulties the Pope did not lose courage, but resolved to offer the greatest resistance possible under the circumstances. Assuming the rôle of commander-in-chief, he first procured a supply of corn from Sicily and then gave directions to the Roman generals on the frontier watching the movements of the Lombards. The first to give signs of activity was the Duke of Spoleto. But the Pope was on guard and at once directed the General Velox, to whom at the same time he sent reinforcements, to keep a vigilant lookout for the Lombard chief, so as to discover his objective, Rome or Ravenna. As soon as this became clear, Velox was ordered to harass his rear and at the same time to send part of his troops to invade Spoleto, so as to compel the Duke to return to defend his territory.

The northern frontier of the duchy, whence King Agilulf was expected, was also sadly lacking in means of defense; the town of Nepi, in particular, thirty miles from Rome, had not even a military commander. Gregory sent them one in the person of a certain Leontius, by whom he addressed a letter to the clergy, nobility and people of Nepi, ordering them, under penalty of his severe displeasure, to render him due obedience.[7]

The storm did not burst, however, until the summer of 592, when Ariulf appeared before Rome, while at the same time the Duke of Benevento marched on Naples. This city was in even a worse plight than Rome, having no officer of high rank to direct the defense, and the Bishop was dead. But, as in the case of Nepi, the Pope attended to the matter and sent the tribune Constantius to command the Neapolitan garrison.

But the prospect of successful defense of the Eternal City against the invaders, in spite of Gregory's efforts, seems to have been very slight. In a letter to the Archbishop of Ravenna, written at this time, the Pope complains bitterly of the Exarch's inactivity, while the Lombards without let or hindrance are devastating the Campagna with fire and sword.[8] The regular soldiers, he adds, have been withdrawn from Rome and only some militia remain, who, in default of pay, refuse even to mount guard. In these circumstances the Pope asks authorization from the Exarch to conclude a separate peace with the Duke of Spoleto. Receiving no reply to this demand, Gregory took the bold step of concluding a truce on his own responsibility.

This act of the Pope at length aroused the Exarch, who now issued forth from Ravenna, and with little difficulty won back all the towns, including Perugia, whose possession was of particular importance, that had recently been captured by the Lombards. At the conclusion of this feat, Romanus entered Rome in triumph. After a brief sojourn he departed again for Ravenna, taking with him, to the great indignation of the Romans, not only his own soldiers, but in addition the Theodosian militia, thus leaving Rome without even these doubtful defenders.

But no sooner had the Exarch departed than the Lombards appeared anew, this time the army of King Agilulf himself. The King, with little opposition, recaptured Perugia, thus at a stroke undoing the work of Romanus, after which he marched on Rome. The Romans in the interval, however, had received a small garrison with an able general, and, consequently, were able to make a vigorous resistance. According to a legend of a later age, not mentioned, however, by the Pope's biographers, Agilulf raised the siege at the prayer of Gregory. It is more probable that Agilulf gladly enough raised the siege for a money consideration, and thus was able to take his army to more healthy latitudes than the dangerous Roman Campagna.

---

[7] Ep. ii., 14.

[8] Ep. ii., 45.

The Pope now began to work for a general peace, and through the influence of the Lombard Queen Theodolinda succeeded so far that a truce appears to have been made between imperialists and Lombards. But again Romanus violated its terms and brought upon the unfortunate land once more the horrors of war. Famine threatened through shortage of the usual corn supply, and Rome, which was unable to procure sufficient food for its own population, was crowded with refugees fleeing from the zones of danger. In desperation, therefore, seeing that the imperialists would neither fight nor observe treaties—the Exarch was safe enough in the marshes of Ravenna and appeared to care little for those who had not such protection—Gregory again urged the necessity of a lasting peace, at the same time plainly indicating that if Romanus would not treat with King Agilulf, he himself would.

This attitude of Gregory is expressed in a letter to a friend at Ravenna, in which the Pope, in spite of his loyalty to the empire and his dislike of the Lombards, is yet compelled to admit that in the present state of affairs King Agilulf's position is fair and just. "Agilulf," he writes, "does not refuse to make a general peace, if my Lord the Patrician will consent to arbitration on the matters in dispute between them. He complains that he was grievously wronged in various parts of his dominions during the armistice. And as he demands satisfaction for himself, if his claims be judged reasonable, so he promises to give satisfaction if it be shown that any act of hostility was perpetrated on his side during the peace. As then it is clear that his proposals are fair, there ought to be a judicial investigation of the matter, so that compensation may be made for any wrongs done on either side, provided that a general peace be thus securely established under the protection of God. How necessary such a peace is for us you well know. Act, then, with your usual wisdom, that His Excellency the Exarch may give his consent to the proposal without delay, lest it be thought that the offer of peace is rejected by him, which is not desirable. For if he will not give his consent, Agilulf offers to make a special peace with us."[9]

The gravity of the concluding sentence quoted from this letter can hardly be overestimated: the King of the Lombards offers, in a certain contingency, to conclude a treaty of peace with the Pope, and evidently the Pope is strongly disposed to take him at his word. Gregory was fast losing patience with the Exarch, and, however reluctantly, he seems to regard it as his duty to bring to an end an intolerable state of affairs. For the policy of the imperial authorities was as weak as it was contemptible; they concluded a truce when hard pressed, and violated it without scruple when they saw a possibility of advantage from so doing. In their eyes their opponents were barbarians to be got rid of in any way that presented itself. But Gregory, although unalterably opposed to them politically, yet demands that faith be kept with the Lombards, and in this letter he plainly indicates a resolution on his part, in the event of the Exarch's decision to prolong a war in which he was unable to accomplish any useful end, to accept the offer of the Lombard monarch. For in the interest of his fellow-countrymen he can no longer tolerate a situation in which the people of Italy are exposed to the gravest perils, just because it suits Ravenna to repudiate treaties. We have already seen something of the terrible character of these perils, but a still more vivid picture of Italy's distress may be read in the famous homily preached by Gregory at the time of Agilulf's descent upon Rome. "We see on all sides sorrows," says the Pope; "we hear on all sides groans. Cities are destroyed, fortifications razed to the ground, fields devastated, the land reduced to solitude. No husbandman is left in the fields, few inhabitants remain in the cities, and yet these scanty remnants of the human race are still each day smitten without ceasing. The scourges of divine justice cease not, because even while they smite us our sins are not corrected. Some men are led away captive, others are mutilated, others slain before our eyes. . . . What Rome herself, once deemed the mistress of the world, has now become, we see—wasted away with afflictions, grievous and many, with the loss of citizens, the assault of enemies, the frequent fall of ruined buildings. . . . For where is the Senate, where are the people? . . . Yet even we few who remain are daily smitten by the sword, still are daily crushed by innumerable afflictions."[10]

---

[9] Ep. v., 34.

In these heartrending circumstances, and the situation did not in the least improve from year to year, who will blame the great-hearted Pope for demanding from the Exarch a cessation of hostilities? Gregory knew quite well that without serious exertion the imperialists would never drive the Lombards out of Italy, and at the same time it was perfectly clear that Constantinople would not make the necessary exertions. Yet in the Micawber-like hope that something might some day turn up, they insisted on perpetuating an endless desultory war which brought ruin to the nation. It was this destructive war that the Pope determined to stop. The modern secularist, of course, regards his action as high-handed and talks about legal authority. This is all very well. But Gregory was the exponent of a higher law than that which governed the Roman Empire, in virtue of which he interfered in behalf of a sorely tried people.

---

[10] Hom. in Ezech., II., 6, sec. 22, 23.

It was not to be supposed, however, that a Roman Emperor would take kindly to so great an assumption of power on the part of any ecclesiastic, and so we are not surprised to find that the Emperor Maurice wrote in the severest terms to Gregory in condemnation of his course. But Gregory, in his answer, while employing the customary high-sounding terms of respect, replied in kind to the Emperor. Among the expressions of reproach applied to the Pope by Maurice was that of "simple," because he allowed himself to be duped by the Lombards. Gregory, who regarded this epithet, used without qualification, as synonymous with "fool," answered that indeed, in one sense, he deserved it, since had he been other than a fool, he would not have endured all he had "amidst the swords" of the Lombards. Then he enters on a lengthy justification of those acts of his which had displeased Constantinople, in the course of which, though in respectful language, he returns the compliment of the Emperor. "As to my reports concerning Ariulf," he says, "that he was ready with all his heart to come over to the Republic, I am not believed; and that means that I am also accused of being a liar. But although I am not worthy to be a priest, I know that a priest is the servant of truth, and that it is a deadly insult to call him a liar. . . .

"If, indeed, the subjection of my country were not advancing day by day, I would gladly say nothing about being despised and laughed at myself. But this troubles me more than anything else, that the very causes which bring on me the charge of falsehood are daily leading Italy captive under the yoke of the Lombards. While my statements are disbelieved, the strength of the enemy is terribly increasing. This, however, I suggest to my most religious Lord, to think what evil he likes of me, but not to lend a ready ear to every one who talks about the interest of the State and the means of saving Italy; to trust to deeds rather than to words.

"I was robbed of the peace which, without any expense to the State, I made with the Lombards of Tuscia. Then, when the peace was broken, the soldiers were removed from the city. Some of them were slain by the enemy; some were stationed at Narni and Perugia, Rome being abandoned that Perugia might be garrisoned. After this there was a worse affliction when Agilulf came, and I saw with my own eyes men tied by the neck like dogs and led off to be sold as slaves in France (Francia). And as we who were within the city by the protection of God escaped his hands, an excuse is sought for blaming us, because, forsooth, the supply of corn was deficient, whereas it is quite impossible to keep a large supply of corn for a long time in Rome, as I have more fully explained in another report. . . .

"And whereas my religious sovereigns set before me the awful, the terrible judgment of Almighty God, I pray them by that same Almighty God not to do so again: for we know not how any man will stand in that judgment. This one thing, however, I do say, that, unworthy and sinful as I am, I trust more in the mercy of Jesus when He comes than in the justice of your piety. There are many things concerning that judgment which men know not. Perhaps what you praise He will blame, and what you blame He will praise."[11]

No further allusion to this subject is found in the correspondence of Gregory the Great; whence it may be concluded that Maurice allowed the matter to drop. Negotiations for peace dragged along until the death of the Exarch Romanus and were not finally concluded till the year 599 under his successor, Callinicus. But even after peace had been established between King Agilulf and the new Exarch, Gregory still was fearful of the restless dukes, his neighbors of Spoleto and Benevento. Nor were his fears groundless. Ariulf especially continued to plunder, sporadically, Roman territory until his death eventually relieved the harassed Pope from his barbarous activities.

But the Pope's worries from the Duke of Spoleto were no sooner at an end than another dreadful pestilence broke out in Italy and extended eventually even to Africa. In Rome scarcely enough men were left to man the walls, while Gregory himself suffered excruciating agonies from the gout, being scarcely ever able during two years to leave his bed. As if this were not enough, war broke out again in 601. Seeing an opportunity of profiting by a revolt of some Lombard dukes against their king, the Exarch, following the established Byzantine tradition, violated the treaty by attacking Parma, where he captured King Agilulf's daughter, with her husband. Aroused to fury by such treachery, Agilulf attacked and captured Padua, devastated Istria and defeated the Exarch outside the walls of Ravenna. Cremona and Mantua were subsequently taken, nor was peace again concluded, to the great disadvantage of the empire, until after the dethronement and death of the Emperor Maurice. The Exarch Smaragdus, sent by the new Emperor Phocas to replace Callinicus, signalized his viceroyalty, first by restoring

---

[11] Ep. v., 36.

King Agilulf's daughter, and, secondly, by concluding a truce, September, 603, for eighteen months with the Lombard monarch, so that after all the troubles of his pontificate from political conditions in Italy, Pope Gregory the Great had his last hours brightened with the existing cessation of hostilities and the promise of a lasting peace.

Another event that augured well for the future was the baptism in the Catholic faith of the infant son of King Agilulf and Queen Theodolinda. According to Paul the Deacon, the King himself also became a Catholic, but there is no contemporary authority for this assertion. The heir to the Lombard throne was, therefore, of the religion of the great majority of Italians, a fact that was calculated to exercise a twofold influence on the destinies of the Lombard people: the royal example would lead others to adopt the orthodox religion, and at the same time the gradual removal of the religious barrier that separated Lombards from Italians would open a way for an amalgamation of the two races. Yet, as we shall see, the Lombards never fully arose to the occasion; whence, ultimately, the overthrow of their monarchy.

BYZANTINE OFFICIALS.

In the performance of his multifarious duties the Pope had necessarily frequent relations with the officials of the empire, particularly those engaged in the administrative affairs of Italy. These personages, as a whole, had little love for Gregory. From their point of view, there were reasons in abundance for this absence of affection, since the Pope, and under his directions the Bishops, were the constant and powerful protectors of the people against the exactions of corrupt servants of the Government. Not that Gregory was a meddler in affairs that did not concern him as an ecclesiastic; on the contrary, he scrupulously refrained from intruding on the civil domain, save as we have seen for the defense of his country. The general principle by which he was guided in this regard is summed up in the following extract from a letter of the Pope to his representative in Sicily, the Sub-deacon Peter. "Let the nobles and the Praetor," he enjoins, "like you for your humility and not dread you for your pride. Yet if you hear that they are doing any wrong to the poor, put away your humility at once and take a lofty tone. When they do well be always submissive to them, but when they do ill oppose them with all your might." This excellent rule of ecclesiastical procedure was exemplified admirably in Gregory's own conduct. During his pontificate we find him exhibiting the utmost respect for the authority of the Emperor and his representatives, nor did he interfere in the concerns of civil officials, save when the principles of justice or of charity were violated.

An incident referred to in a letter to the Empress Constantina shows the attitude of the Pope in matters of this order. We have already alluded to the corruption of the Byzantine officials of this period; it was to call attention to a particularly glaring case of the kind that Gregory addressed the Empress. From his letter it appears that many of the inhabitants of the island of Sardinia were still heathen and that the Governor of the island was accustomed to permit, for a monetary consideration, those who wished to offer sacrifice to their idols. At this juncture a zealous missionary Bishop sent by the Pope arrived in the island and preached the Gospel to the pagans with so much success that a fruitful source of revenue to the Governor was seriously threatened. This official, however, was equal to the occasion, and calmly continued to collect from the converts the tax they had paid as heathens.

The Bishop remonstrated, but the Governor replied that he had to resort to methods of this kind in order to make up the sum he had agreed to pay for his appointment. The Bishop then referred the matter to the Pope, from whom we learn the facts in the case. The same letter of the Pope calls the attention of Constantina to an even worse abuse practiced by an official in the island of Corsica; so rapacious was this personage, so heavy his exactions, that to meet them many had to sell their children into slavery. "Hence it comes to pass," Gregory comments, "that those who own estates in the island forsake the Holy Empire and are compelled to take refuge with the infamous Lombards. For what outrage can the barbarians inflict on them more cruel than to force them by oppression and extortion to sell their own children?" In Sicily also a certain official named Stephen carried things with so high a hand as to seize for the State, without any process of law, the property of private individuals.

Against these abuses the Pope invokes the influence of the Empress with her husband that the injustices complained of might be repaired. "I beg my most serene lady to consider these facts carefully and to still the groans of the oppressed. For I do not believe that these things have ever come to your ears. Had they done so, they would surely not have continued till now. But they thought to be brought under the Emperor's notice at a favorable moment, that he may remove this great, this grievous weight from his own soul, from his empire and from his children. Only think, what must be the thoughts, what the feelings of parents when they sell their children to save themselves from torture? You who have children of your own should know how to pity the children of others.

I trust, therefore, that it will be sufficient for me to have made this brief statement, lest, if your piety were unaware of what is being done in these provinces, I should be punished by the severe Judge for the sin of my silence."[12]

Very interesting also is another protest made by Gregory in behalf of an accused official, as showing his attitude on the question of the rights and dignity of a Roman citizen. It appears that about the year 598 a high officer of the court, the ex-Consul Leontius, was sent from Constantinople to examine the accounts of certain subordinate officials in Italy. Among these was a person named Libertinus, who was found guilty of embezzling public funds. The culprit was sentenced to a heavy fine and scourged. From his general knowledge of the conduct of Libertinus the Pope had previously had a favorable opinion of him, and accordingly had given him letters of recommendation to Leontius. But these letters, as the Pope took care to explain when he heard of the sentence imposed, were based on the notorious fact that Libertinus had proved a good Governor and was highly thought of in his province. Moreover, his recommendation only implied the Pope's wish that the accused should get a fair trial and, if guilty, receive adequate punishment, But Gregory evidently entertained serious doubts as to the fairness of the trial. He had heard, for example, that Leontius in examining the accounts of the accused had failed to make allowance for the expenditure of certain moneys that had really been spent by order of the Emperor.

But aside from the question of guilt or innocence, the old Roman in the Pope regarded it as an outrage that a Roman should be scourged. On this subject Gregory expressed himself in strong terms to the ex-Consul. In his opinion, even if Libertinus, after a fair trial, had been found guilty, his punishment should have been a fine and no more. Because "when freemen are scourged, to say nothing of the fact that Almighty God is offended, to say nothing of the fact that your own fame is sadly stained, the glory of our Most Religious Emperor's reign is altogether obscured. For there is this difference between the kings of the nations and the Roman Emperor, that the former have slaves for their subjects, the latter free men. And, therefore, in all your acts your first object should be to maintain justice, your second to preserve a perfect liberty. You ought to value the liberty of those you are appointed to judge as jealously as though it were your own; and if you would not be wronged yourself by your superiors, you should guard with respect the liberty of your inferiors."[13]

---

[12] Ep. v., 38.

[13] Ep. xi., 4.

The privileges of Roman citizenship at this period were, if we may judge from the general arbitrariness of imperial administration, little more than a memory. The Church alone, and especially the Western Church, kept alive the very idea of liberty, first, by her ever vigilant watch lest the State should encroach on her sphere, and, secondly, by her constant defense of the poor and friendless. Conscientious churchmen, as we have seen in the case of Pope Gregory, regarded it as a matter of the highest obligation to watch over the welfare of their flock, in the temporal as well as in the spiritual order.

POPE AND EMPEROR.

Yet, while maintaining this attitude of reasonable resistance to encroachments of a dangerous character, the Church at the same time, for the sake of peace, frequently tolerated minor intrusions of the civil power. In previous papers we have seen more than one example in illustration of this modus agendi; a few instances from the pontificate of Gregory the Great shall now be related.

One of the gravest abuses introduced into the Church since the conversion of Constantine was that the nomination of Bishops, especially in the East, was, in most important sees, controlled by the Emperor. There was not, of course, the ghost of canonical right for such control; it was an usurpation by Cæsar, pure and simple, of a right that belonged to the spiritual domain. The forms of canonical election were, it is true, generally observed, but the Emperor's will, when he so desired, was paramount, and his known candidate was invariably chosen. Almost of equal moment was another prerogative exercised by emperors since the reign of Constantine, namely, that of deposing Bishops who, for one reason or another, happened to displease them.

Numerous instances of imperial arbitrariness in these respects occur in Byzantine ecclesiastical annals. The attitude of the Emperor Maurice towards the Church, as a rule, was indeed much more correct than that of most of his Christian predecessors. But even he occasionally lapsed, as, for instance, in the case of a Bishop of Justiniana Prima, whom, on account of ill health, he wished to depose. Gregory protested, saying he could not countenance a proceeding so opposed to the canons, and went on to say that "if the Bishop will not ask permission to resign, our Most Religious Sovereign has the power of doing what he likes and carrying out whatever he orders. He may make what arrangements he thinks fit, only he must not expect us to take part in the deposition of such a man. If what he does is in accordance with the canons, we shall confirm it; if it is not, we shall submit to it, so far as we can do so without sin."

Another example of Gregory's dealing with the head of the State in an ecclesiastical matter related to the Bishop of Salona, Maximus, whose election, as irregular, the Pope declined to confirm, while at the same time he expressed his willingness to go as far as possible towards meeting the wishes of the Emperor. The case was as follows: Maximus was "ordained" without the knowledge of the Pope's Responsalis, something "which never happened under former princes." When the knowledge of this came to Gregory he wrote directing Maximus to refrain, under pain of excommunication, from saying Mass until the circumstances of his election should be inquired into. But Maximus, supported by "certain secular persons," paid no attention to the Pope's order. Yet the Emperor took the part of the excommunicated Bishop. Maurice did indeed direct Maximus to go to Rome and make his peace with the Pope, but at the same time he enjoined the Pope to receive the offender with honor. This Gregory refused to do until the accusations against him should be disposed of. "Now I," he wrote, "obeying the injunction of their Piety, have from my heart forgiven this Maximus his presumption in passing over me and my Responsalis in his ordination, even as though he had been ordained with my authority. But his other wrongs, namely, his bodily transgressions, which I have heard of, and his having been elevated through bribery and his having presumed to say Mass while excommunicated, these things, for the sake of God, I cannot pass over without inquiry."[14]

The remarkable letter of Gregory to the Emperor defending the right of those who so desired to enter the ecclsiastical state, and protesting against an edict promulgated by Maurice denying such right to certain classes of persons, throws still further light on the Pope's idea of the correct attitude of the Head of the Church towards the Head of the State. The new imperial law forbade civil officials, as well as soldiers who had not served their full term in the army, from entering a monastery. When the edict reached the Pope he protested against its restrictions in the following terms: "I received the law of my lords," he begins, "to which at the time, being worn out with bodily illness, I was unable to make any reply. In it the Piety of my lords has ordained that it shall not be lawful for any one who is engaged in public administration to enter on an ecclesiastical office. And this I greatly commended, knowing by most evident proof that one who is in haste to forsake a secular pursuit and assume an ecclesiastical office is not willing to relinquish secular affairs, but to change them. But that it was said in the same law that it should not be lawful for him to become a monk I was altogether surprised, seeing that his accounts can be rendered through a monastery, and it can be arranged also that his debts can be recovered from the place into which he is received.

---

[14] Ep. v., 21.

"It is added also in the same law that no one who is marked on the hand[15] may become a monk. This ordinance I confess to my lords has alarmed me greatly, since by it the way to heaven is closed to many. For there are many who are able to lead a religious life in a secular condition, but there are very many who cannot in any wise be saved with God unless they give up all things. For power over all things has been given to the Piety of my lords to this end: that they who aspire to God may be helped, and that the way to heaven may be more widely open, so that an earthly kingdom may wait upon a heavenly kingdom. And, lo, it is said in plain words that one who has been marked to serve as an earthly soldier may not, unless he has completed his service or been rejected for weakness of body, serve as a soldier of the Lord Jesus Christ.

"To this, behold, Christ, through me, the last of His servants and of yours, will answer, saying: 'From a notary I have made thee a Count of the bodyguard; from a Count of the bodyguard I have made thee Cæsar; from Cæsar I have made thee Emperor, and not only this, but the father of Emperors. I have committed my priests to thy hands, and dost thou withdraw thy soldiers from my service?' Tell thy servant, most pious lord, I beseech thee, what wilt thou answer to thy Lord when He comes and thus speaks? I, indeed, being subject to your command, have caused this law to be transmitted through various parts of the world, and, inasmuch as the law itself is by no means pleasing to Almighty God, lo, I have by this my representation declared to my most serene lords."[16]

GREGORY AND PHOCAS.

From the general tone of Gregory's correspondence with the Emperor Maurice it would seem that the Pope had little admiration for the Emperor. Maurice, indeed, appears to have been, on the whole, rather a well-meaning sort of person, but his acts hardly always corresponded with his intentions. However this may be, his reign of twenty years ended abruptly November, 602. An unexpected revolt of the army cost him, together with four of his sons, his throne and life. His oldest son, Theodosius, for the moment escaped, but on his return journey from Persia, whither he had gone seeking aid, he also fell into the hands of the leader of the revolt, now the Emperor Phocas, and was put to death.

---

[15] Soldiers and slaves were thus marked.

[16] Ep. iii., 65.

An embassy announcing the accession of Phocas arrived in Rome April 25, 603, and was received with the usual ceremonies by the clergy, the Senate and the people. Subsequently the statues of the new ruler and the Empress, as was customary, were placed in the oratory of St. Cæsarius, in the Lateran Palace. So far all was merely routine, but the next development at first view is a disappointment to the numerous admirers of Pope Gregory the Great. The occurrence to which we allude was the dispatch by the Pope of letters to the usurper and his wife expressing in the warmest terms his satisfaction at their accession.[17] How are we to reconcile the writing of such letters by the scrupulous Pope to sovereigns who had reached the throne by revolt against lawful authority, ending in murder? But the question is, when the Pope wrote those letters did he know, in all their atrocity, the facts as to the manner in which Phocas had ascended the throne? A priori it is impossible to suppose it, but we are not left alone to conjecture in the matter. Father Grisar has pointed out[18] that at this period communication by sea between Constantinople and Ravenna was cut off from the middle of November to the beginning of March each year. Now, Maurice was put to death November 27, 602, and the embassy announcing the accession of Phocas arrived in Rome April 25 of the following year. Is it not, asks Grisar, highly probable that the imperial embassy brought the first news to Rome of the death of the late Emperor? It need hardly be added that the version of the story prepared for the Pope was likely to be of such a character as completely to exonerate the new Emperor, and as Gregory's relations with Maurice had often been unsatisfactory, his congratulations to his successor were more than ordinarily warm. Another circumstance that adds to the probability of this explanation, being the correct one, is the fact that just then the empire was at war with the Avars, a circumstance which made communication by land with the West during the winter months very uncertain. Taking into consideration, therefore, the slowness of communication in the seventh century, it is probable that even when the Pope announced to Phocas in a third letter the appointment of an Apocrisiarius he was still unacquainted with the real state of the case.[19] Gregory lived eleven months after the accession of Phocas, and during this time no further correspondence appears to have taken place between him and the Emperor, a fact that in itself goes far towards proving that when the real story of the dethronement got to the Pope he was far from condoning the crimes of the usurper.

---

[17] Ep. xiii., 31 and 39.

[18] Roma alla Fine dell' Mondo Antico, 206 sqq.

[19] *Cf.* Weise, "Italien und die Longobardenherrschaft," p. 238, who says on this point: "It is highly probable that during the winter" (the Pope) "could not receive any certain information about events at Constantinople."

From the foregoing summary of the activities of Gregory the Great, in so far as these related to matters temporal, it is apparent that the chief figure in the ecclesiastical world at the close of the sixth century was at the same time a highly important political figure in Italy. Of course, the great influence in affairs enjoyed by Gregory was not by any means wholly due to his personality. For nearly three centuries prior to his pontificate his predecessors had nobly fulfilled the obligations imposed by trying circumstances, in the material as well as in the spiritual order, towards the people of the peninsula. Gregory succeeded to all this inherited prestige, just as any other person in his place would have done. But he had a special merit all his own, in that he added enormously to the treasury of well-won popularity long enjoyed by the Papacy. In fact, as we have seen, the great Pope was the one individual in whom the Italians of his time could put all their trust. Doubly oppressed as these were—on the one hand by the barbarous Lombards, on the other by corrupt officers of the empire—the Pope was their sole reliance, the only possible refuge in their appalling distress. How nobly Gregory responded to their appeal, how tirelessly he labored in their behalf, in spite of ill health, in the face of calamities without number, the mere outlines given above of his lifework reveal in some, though by no means adequate, degree.

MAURICE M. HASSETT.

Harrisburg, Pa.

CATHOLICISM AND THE FUTURE.

PIUS X.

I HAVE, in my intercourse with priests and laymen, in various parts of the world, listened to many interesting accounts of audiences with the Holy Father and of the impressions which such audiences have invariably left upon their minds.

When I come to summarize these impressions and ask myself: which of them is the strongest and the one which would seem to be that of almost all minds? I would have to answer: the sentiment of sincere love and veneration. It is with these two sentiments that the present Pope seems to inspire all those who come in personal contact with him. All seem to be conscious of the charm of his sweet personality, which is displayed in the hundred and one little things which go to constitute personality, and which one often finds it so difficult to define or to describe in detail.

Leo XIII. inspired the mind with a feeling of profound respect—something almost akin to fear. In his presence one became vaguely conscious of the gulf which separates the supreme guardian of the Church from the ordinary mortal. He seemed to be something quite apart and distinct—some being from another world, living a life and entertaining ideals to which the ordinary man must always remain more or less a stranger. One carried away the impression that a spiritual giant, especially formed and moulded for his gigantic task, was watching over the destinies of the Universal Church.

Pius X. does not inspire impressions and sentiments of the same kind. He seems to be a more tangible part of our common humanity, a man made of stuff such as we are and touched with the feelings of our infirmity. There is about him that exquisite charm which characterizes men of simple and humble mind and which attracts us toward them and constrains us to love them.

How much greater is this love and veneration when we meet with these characteristics in one who wields such vast and unique powers and in whose life all the circumstances combine to develop the very opposite qualities.

There is surely not a more touching and pathetic sight in the world than the picture of this simple and humble-minded Pope, standing in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation which is devising and employing every artifice calculated to destroy him and to minimize and discredit his authority, and yet with the steady and unerring hand of a divine faith firmly grasping the wheel which controls the great rudder of the Church and watching its slightest and apparently most insignificant deviations.

It is not every man who can preserve his manifest simplicity and singleness of heart under similar conditions and in a similar position. That he does preserve it and that he continues to possess these qualities becomes obvious to every person who approaches him and who has the privilege of spending some little time in his presence.

I have had the honor of several private interviews with Pius X.—one of them of exceptional length—and if I were asked what impressions I carried away from these interviews, I should reply: The Pope's transparent and utter sincerity and what I may call his directness. It is these two qualities and characteristics that have impressed me most of all.

It is impossible to sit opposite the Pope, observe the interest with which he listens to what one may have to tell him of one's work and aims, consider his questions and the manner in which he receives their answers, weigh his suggestions and his counsels, without feeling that one is in the presence of an entirely honest man, who means every word he utters and who is far too simple and true to affect an interest which he does not feel. When he declares that it will be the supreme aim and purpose of his life "to restore all things in Christ," one may be absolutely sure that this is no mere official and conventional phrase, but the burning desire of an entirely sincere and truth-loving heart. It is impossible to connect with the Pope the very notion of mental reserve or simulation or the attempt to disguise what he really feels and thinks. And he manifestly assumes sincerity and uprightness of purpose on the part of those who approach him, for it is with utter sincerity that he deals with them. His words are simple and straightforward and direct, and there is no prevarication. Would that the words of some of our rulers in Church and State had similar directness and sincerity! The world would be the better and happier for it.

I have always felt that if I had become a priest and had by any chance found myself in some kind of trouble—either with my Bishop or with my people, it is to this Pope that I would have gone, it is to him to whom I would have opened my heart. I would have felt that my cause would be safe with him, provided I could give evidence of loyalty and sincerity of purpose and of the singleness of my aim. I cannot understand why priests who may happen to be in such trouble do not more frequently adopt this course. The Pope, it seems to me, is more easy of access, more ready to lend an ear to the sorrows of his people than many of our Bishops and superiors.

When the Prince Max episode occurred, a little while ago, the papers reported interviews which the Prince was supposed to have had with the Pope. Nearly all of them described a scene in which the Holy Father was depicted as exhibiting severe wrath and threatening the Prince with the most dreadful punishments. It was even reported that the Prince had resented this treatment and had abruptly left Rome without having made his submission. Little, I thought, do these wretched scribblers know the characters of the Pope and of the Prince. For I can so well imagine what the real interview was like. For who knows better than Pius X. how easy it is for the best of men to make mistakes and with the best intentions in the world to fall into error. What the Pope would insist upon, I imagine, would be sincere regret and sorrow and the desire, as far as may be possible, to amend the fault. But where this disposition prevailed there could surely be no shadow of doubt as to his attitude.

It seems to me to be very evident that Pius X. is a Pope such as the times in which we live require and need. The world has seen much of intellectual achievement, and, in the matter of its highest interests, is beginning to distrust them. In the spiritual sphere they have never done very much for the world. They will most certainly never bring it back to God. What we need to-day is the simplicity of Christ, men holding and proclaiming the truth in sincerity and manifesting it in the form of an attractive and holy and consistent personality. Such a personality is the best argument for the truth of the Gospel and is a living letter of Christ to the world.

Other Popes have inspired men with zeal and enthusiasm which have led them to risk life and limb in their cause and even to take up the arms of flesh in the defense of their ideals. Pius X. inspires them with love and affection, which lead them constantly to pray for him and to coöperate with him, in however humble and obscure a degree, in his efforts to win men back to God and to restore all things in Christ.

THE POPE AND SPIRITISM.

When last I was in Rome I had come in response to an intimation which had reached me from a prominent personage who had long been keenly interested in my writings and my work, and who realized the difficulties under which I was laboring. It is not easy for a layman to make his voice heard in the matter of a grave peril slowly but steadily invading modern society and undermining the faith of thousands. Ignorance and misconception and the suspicion of a misdirected zeal and of possibly imperfect knowledge, exhibited often even by those whom one might reasonably expect to know better and to be a help rather than a hindrance, are apt to bar the way and to paralyze progress. I suppose that every layman who has some great cause to defend has met with these checks and has been called upon to exercise tact and circumspection and patience; I had been called upon to exercise these qualities in an exceptional degree and for years have had to patiently abide my time.

I had now been informed that the Holy Father had become keenly alive to the dangers threatening the religious life in the present age from unfavorable inferences hastily drawn by scientific students of modern psychical science and by the increasing interest taken by the masses in spiritistic phenomena. It had been explained to the Pope and to His Eminence Cardinal Merry del Val that while I had an experimental knowledge of the subject (gathered in my non-Catholic days), I held correct and Catholic views respecting it, and had, in books and lectures, warned against the steadily growing danger.

I was personally anxious, I need not say, to secure for my work the approval of the Pope and the support of the Holy See.

When I came to Rome I had the honor of a long and, for my cause, truly important interview with His Eminence. I was delighted to find him keenly interested in and acquainted with my subject. This interest was evidently due to the development in psychical matters which had then taken place in Italian scientific circles and to a lecture on the subject which had been delivered under the very shadow of the Vatican. It was impossible for a man such as he not to realize the significance of such a movement and its influence upon religious thought.

I felt at the close of this interview that I had gained a strong friend and supporter in the Cardinal. He kindly undertook to prepare the way for me, and a few days later I had an audience with the Pope. My learned Roman friend accompanied me. I had come prepared to make a detailed statement, and I had brought with me much documentary evidence which, in the course of years, had come into my hands. And I had so prepared it that its presentation might occupy the least possible time. But imagine my delight when I found that, although the Pope carefully listened to and inspected all my evidence, he was really very accurately acquainted with the subject. There was no need in his case, as in the case of so many priests and even Bishops, to convince him of the reality and objectivity of spiritistic phenomena. He knew only too well that they existed. A very load was off my mind when I discovered this fact. And although I have for many years past, and in many lands, in the dioceses of the northern world and on the shores of the Pacific, discussed this subject with men and women in all conditions of life, have explained it in seminaries and universities and have answered questions innumerable put by thoughtful inquirers, I have never discussed the subject with so great a sense of satisfaction with any person as it was discussed with the Supreme Pontiff. Our audience lasted over an hour, and my friend and I both felt, when we came down the steps of the Vatican, that a great point had been gained and a great victory won. I feel, said my friend, a profound scholar of world-wide reputation, that this is really a red-letter day in the history of Catholic thought. What a wonderful man the Pope is! How clearly we can recognize the action of Divine Providence in placing him where he is.

In what light Pius X. regards Spiritism and the assumptions of some scientific men respecting the moral value of what one may term the modern psychical movement is best illustrated by a story which the Pope told us in the course of this interesting audience. It was told simply and in the manner in which an Italian alone can tell an interesting story and with that touch of humor which, I am sure, is one of the many charming characteristics of the Holy Father's disposition.

A lady, he told us, had repeatedly requested a private audience with him. It had been explained to her that the Pope was a busy man, and that in order to secure a special interview it would be necessary for her to state what the purpose of her visit or mission was. She had declined, however, to furnish any such statement, explaining that it was to the Pope alone that she could unbosom herself. After repeated and unsuccessful attempts to obtain this audience, the matter had finally been mentioned to the Holy Father, and he had at once and most kindly expressed his willingness to receive the lady.

When she was brought to him he inquired the object of her coming and what he could do for her. The lady explained that she had come to complain to the Pope personally of her confessor. He had refused to give her absolution.

The Pope, of course, expressed his surprise at this procedure and sympathetically inquired after its cause. He requested the lady to tell him what it was in her life that could have brought this about. Did she commit sins different from those to which the generality of mankind are subject? Did she frequent company of which her confessor disapproved? Did she hold ideas and beliefs contrary to the creed of the Catholic Church?

All these questions, it seems, were emphatically answered in the negative.

Upon the Pope pressing her for further information she told him that she was the favored subject of special revelations and disclosures. Important and valuable information had come to her from the spirit-world. Deceased friends and relatives had communicated to her truths of the utmost significance to mankind. Quite recently Pope Pius IX. had spoken with her and even the great Leo had made his appearance. She explained that these appearances were now well known and understood and increasingly admitted and recognized by science; the priests alone were hopelessly ignorant of the matter and either did not believe in the reality of these visitations or, when they did believe in them, went so far as to forbid all such intercourse.

Throughout the interview the good lady had not mentioned the word Spiritism or had given any clue as to how these visits of the departed were induced. She had evidently assumed ignorance of the subject on the part of the Holy Father. When she had concluded her statement, the Pope put some searching questions to his visitor, to which he desired accurate and unevasive answers.

I will give in substance what was said, quoting from notes taken immediately on my return from the Vatican.

Pope: Yes! What you have told me is very interesting. You have evidently been shown some signal and exceptional favors. You have had visits from Pio Nono and even from the late holy Pontiff! But now tell me how do you obtain these privileges? Do these personages come to you unbidden, or do you adopt any kind of means to bring about their appearance?

Visitor: They are always near me, Holy Father. But, of course, they cannot become visible or communicate with me unless I furnish certain aids and facilities.

Pope: I see. I see. To facilitate their appearance you take a certain initiative; you form what is called a spirit circle.

Visitor: Yes, Holy Father.

Pope: And you employ the services of a certain person called a medium or a sensitive?

Visitor: Yes, Holy Father.

Pope: And this medium or sensitive, after a time, passes into a state of unconsciousness or trance?

Visitor: Yes, Holy Father.

Pope: And it is when these conditions have been created that the spirits you have named make their appearance?

Visitor: Yes, Holy Father.

Pope: And you have told your confessor that you are practicing this kind of spirit-intercourse?

Visitor: Yes, Holy Father.

Pope: And he has forbidden you to continue these practices?

Visitor: Yes, Holy Father.

Pope: But you have disobeyed him in the belief that he is ignorant while you have a superior kind of knowledge?

Visitor: Yes, Holy Father.

Pope: And you have in spite of your disobedience gone to confession to him and asked for absolution?

Visitor: Yes, Holy Father.

Pope: I see. I see. Well now, my child, go back to your home and tell this worthy priest that you have been to see the Pope and have told him your story. Tell him that the Holy Father is delighted with his firmness and his accurate theological knowledge. Tell him that he blesses him and thoroughly approves of all that he has done. And tell him also that if he continues on this course and thus loyally serves the Church, the Holy Father may some day make him a Bishop.

I have nothing to record that could in anywise throw light upon the feelings and state of mind with which the Pope's visitor left his presence. And I have been wondering what she said to her confessor!

LAY CO-OPERATION.

A great deal has been said in recent times by our Bishops respecting the Church's increasing need of lay coöperation and many a pastoral has dealt with this no doubt very important subject; but it seems to me that, so far, no very clear and well-defined scheme has been proposed or suggested. When one comes down to the ultimate practical question as to the how and when and where all seems vague and misty and undefined. It would be difficult to put in concise form what it is precisely that our Bishops desire and how they think their desires can most effectually be carried out. And the matter manifestly bristles with innumerable difficulties.

In the non-Catholic bodies excellent and extensive use is made of lay agency. There are the active church wardens, relieving the clergyman of much of his financial burden; there are well-organized bodies of church workers and district visitors; there are specially trained and authorized lay readers, who conduct minor services and in some instances really do a good deal of clerical work. The same system is scarcely applicable to Catholic conditions and needs. The circumstances are so very different. There is, in the first place, no money for the systematic maintenance of any kind of lay agency. And there is, in the second place, no desire on the part of our Catholic people to accept lay ministrations. It is the priest and the priest alone whom our people want when they are in domestic trouble or in spiritual difficulties. I should like to know what would happen to the lay person who visited an Irish family on a spiritual mission as the representative of the priest! I doubt very much whether he would repeat his visit. The circumstances and the entire point of view are so very different. The Anglican clergyman, as I have so often said, is really a social and a moral force; the Catholic priest is a spiritual and supernatural one, and for the well-instructed Catholic the former can never by any possible chance perform the duties and functions of the latter, quite apart from the matter of distinctly sacramental ministrations.

But it seems to me that our Bishops and clergy would greatly ease some of their burdens if they made larger use of the responsible lay element in the temporal administration of their parishes, if they entrusted laymen of standing more extensively with offices filled in the Anglican Church by the time-honored church warden. Something like this system is in operation in some parishes, I know, and is working well; but it seems to me that it admits of infinitely greater extension and development. "We clergy," said a priest to me not long ago, "are often regarded by our people as possessing unique opportunities of cultivating our spiritual life and of increasing our knowledge of the things in God. There never was a greater mistake. All that I can think of from morning till night is how to raise the money to keep things going and to pay the interest on the debt of my church." It should be possible, it seems to me, by the display of a greater confidence in the laity and a readiness on the part of the laity favorably situated to free the priest more effectually from some of his galling burdens.

Unfortunately, some laymen do not seem to realize that the undertaking of any such systematic work requires the willing sacrifice of time and leisure. The clergy have often told me that while they have numerous laymen in their parishes always willing to figure on committees and councils and to take part in debates, there are few ready to render serious and systematic and self-denying service. They let the ultimate burden of the work fall upon the priest.

There is, of course, the field of literature, in which a layman can serve his Bishop and the Church. And much has been said and written on this subject of late. But here again there are difficulties, which those who speak about these matters seem to be leaving entirely out of sight.

Literary work demands for its production time and leisure. The man who undertakes it must either possess means or he must produce such work as will enable him to earn a livelihood. Most of our Catholic writers are not persons of means, and our Catholic people cannot be said to be a reading people. Catholic literature, therefore, is badly paid and receives little encouragement and less compensation. It is only one writer here and there who can venture to make a profession of it. It is only one in a hundred who is, by peculiar and exceptional circumstances, brought to the front and who succeeds. Some publishers drive hard and merciless bargains, which make many an author shrink from a second attempt. There is no fund supporting any kind of literary work and helping a man over his initial difficulties. There is in this respect nothing in the Church in any sense approaching organization. The matter, therefore, remains an interesting subject for discussion in Bishops' speeches and pastorals; it never assumes a practical and concrete form.

Early in my Catholic life I was earnestly warned off the ground by several experienced and sensible persons. If I have persevered and in some measure succeeded in spite of this warning, it is solely owing to the circumstance that I have a special and peculiarly interesting subject to deal with, which is increasingly commanding the attention of thoughtful men.

A good many years ago I had an interesting conversation on this subject with the late Cardinal Vaughan, who was keenly conscious of the disadvantages under which we Catholic laymen labor in this respect. He begged me very earnestly to make suggestions. I had written some articles for the *Dublin Review* which had met with his approval. I suggested the formation of a Catholic publishing company, with some funds to back it, paying Catholic authors a fair wage, assisting them while they were arranging for publication or creating fresh work and earnestly inviting the coöperation and aid of the Catholic public. He liked the scheme and thought it feasible and practicable; but unhappily he fell ill and died before anything further could be done in the matter.

Years before the initiation of the American Catholic Encyclopedia I realized the urgent need of some such work. Encyclopedias of every kind could be found on the shelves of the British Museum and in our public libraries; the Catholic Encyclopedia alone was non-existent A Catholic author had to search laboriously and in separate volumes for authoritative information.

I proposed to adapt the great German Kirchen-Lexikon for English readers and students and obtained permission from Herder to carry out the work. It required a little money and an English publisher with a little spirit. Neither the first nor the second could be found, and as a consequence the scheme fell through. These are some examples of the difficulties which beset the Catholic writer anxious to serve the Church and by that service to secure his livelihood.

What is really wanted in respect of this matter is much less talk and a little practical action and organization, so that the Catholic writer can look to at least a little support and is not wholly at the mercy of the publisher whose interest in his work is of a purely commercial and financial character. With the very limited public to which Catholic books appeal in England such support cannot possibly be done without.

I certainly believe in the immense value of sermons and lectures, but I have good reason to value still higher the missionary possibilities of a really good Catholic book. While the first speaks to hundreds, the second often speaks to thousands, and its influence, in some instances, reaches to the uttermost ends of the earth.

All this, of course, applies with equal force to journalism, where the difficulties are often still greater, since the lack of technical knowledge and experience and the wretchedly bad pay often effectually bar the way to success and usefulness. I have written numerous articles for Catholic papers. I have seldom received pecuniary compensation for my work.

Again, there is the lecturing field; but how very limited and circumscribed is this field here in Catholic England! In the Anglican sphere scientific men of repute are apt to concern themselves with religious questions and seek to aid the Church in its conflict with antagonistic thought.

The scientific men engaged in similar work in our sphere can be counted on our fingers. I do not know whether they do not exist or do not care to come forward. In any case, we hear little of them. It may be urged that in the Catholic sphere some of our priests are our scientific men, and this is no doubt very true; but can we really maintain that in this particular field the priest carries more weight than the layman? Is there not the vague consciousness in the educated mind that his are foregone conclusions, since for him only one solution of modern difficulties is thinkable?

Is it not the man who fearlessly conducts his researches in the independent scientific sphere and who, in spite of a thousand influences pulling him in the opposite direction, sees no cause whatever to forsake Catholic ground who carries most weight.

We have to remember that we are living in times when the most loyal Catholics will, in many matters of grave import, think for themselves and when all non-Catholic literature bristles with difficulties in respect of matters of faith. I am speaking from an extensive and in many respects unique knowledge when I say these things. I receive letters sometimes from Catholics asking questions with respect to modern discoveries in my own particular sphere of research which would surprise many a Bishop and priest.

I have a vivid recollection of an interview which I once had with a grand knight of a local body of Knights of Columbus in America. He was a prominent lawyer of much local influence and a leading Catholic layman of the town. I found that he was very fully and accurately informed respecting the most recent discoveries and conclusions in the matter of psychical science and expressed it as his own opinion that the Church's view of the matter was an erroneous one; he stood on the side of her opponents. He thought the scientific attitude of mind to be by far the more intelligible and reasonable one.

We are, I am persuaded, indulging in this respect in a false and somewhat dangerous security, and I am inclined to think that there will be a painful awakening some day. Our Bishops are apt to take too much for granted. They trust too much in the appearance of things. It would be well, I think, if they could succeed in increasingly drawing the scientific lay element into the service of the Church and secure its active aid and coöperation. There is for it here most certainly a splendid field of useful activity. And money devoted to this purpose would most certainly be well invested.

What we require in our days is not general information on the great subjects affecting religious thought. Such information is constantly and freely given in magazines and newspapers. What we require is full and really accurate information founded upon full and accurate knowledge of specific subjects.

A good lecture by a scientific man on some of the burning questions of the day which can scarcely fail to puzzle the mind may tend to remove a mountain of difficulties and may save many a truth-loving Catholic from losing his faith. One is sometimes distressed at witnessing the intense activity which reigns in the non-Catholic field and our own indifference and inactivity. This is no doubt in large measure due to that instinctive and very proper sense that nothing can seriously affect our position; but it is possible to carry this a little too far. I think it was our present Pope who once said that one of the greatest perils of our day was the apathy of the good, and there is a very great truth in this. Scientific knowledge, it is true, cannot give us supernatural faith and save our souls, but it can most certainly remove those barriers which prevent the effectual exercise of that faith and which are apt to keep the soul in the bondage of doubt, or at least of misgiving. "The Catholic of the nineteenth century," writes Archbishop Ireland in his introduction to "The Life of Father Hecker," "all the world over is too quiet, too easily resigned to the will of God, attributing to God the effects of his own timidity and indolence."

"If this modern movement," said a thoughtful spiritualist to me not very long ago, "is really due to the activities of the devil, as your Church seems to teach, all I can say is that the devil's intelligence department is far better equipped than yours. You give little evidence to the world that you really believe the doctrines that you proclaim."

The layman, on the other hand, if the Church honors him by making use of his knowledge and his services must act with tact and discretion. He must keep to his own sphere of work and research. He must not invade the sphere which by right is that of the priest and the theologian, except perhaps in the way of drawing very general inferences and conclusions. He must not indulge in unsafe and illegitimate theories and speculations. He must give evidence to his Bishop that he can be trusted entirely and unreservedly.

My experience has taught me that it is often this feeling of a perhaps justified misgiving on the part of our Bishops with regard to the layman and a certain lack of tact and discretion on his part which hinder much useful service and coöperation. The times are too dangerous, and religious and scientific error, in their most attractive forms, are too rampant to admit of any but an absolutely safe course.

And in the present state of our knowledge it seems to me to be a *sine quâ non,* too, that the layman who thinks he has a message for educated Catholics should be a specialist in his department, a man thoroughly well up in the particular subject with which he ventures to deal. It is impossible for any man in our days to know many subjects well; if he makes any such attempt, he is only likely to lose himself in vague generalities and in unconvincing inferences. Serious men ask for truth and for facts, carefully collected and patiently examined and verified and supported by incontrovertible evidence; they care little for personal views and theories.

The days of the lecturer who carries his audience by the tricks of rhetoric or by appeals to the imagination or emotions clearly are over. These things are despised and seen through by really thinking and educated men, however much they may impress and move the masses.

I cannot help feeling that some kind of organization on practical and common sense lines and corresponding to the needs of a particular diocese would lead to some very useful and practical results. It is difficult to see how any such results can be achieved without it.

For the work of the Catholic lecturer an infinitely better and wider field, of course. exists in the United States of North America. Lecturing there is organized in the sense that it really constitutes a recognized profession. The specialist lecturer may be met with in all parts of the country and in all kinds of institutions. And if he has really some specific and interesting information to impart, there is probably no man in the world who receives a more kindly and hearty welcome. And his services are in most instances generously remunerated.

The American of thoughtful and studious temperament has a craving for information on subjects not perhaps immediately and easily accessible to him and he will spend his money and put himself to much inconvenience to satisfy that craving. I can in this respect speak from considerable personal experience. I have delivered lectures on psychical research in various parts of the world, but I do not think that I have had anywhere such keen and appreciative audiences as in the educational institutions of America. It is there not merely a question of spending an interesting evening; the

American student *wants to know* and does not let one go until he does know. He has always a host of questions to ask and he will ask them one way or another—either personally at the end of a lecture or by letter, or by seeking an interview on the following day. And woe to the man who has not his subject at his fingers' ends and can give good and solid reasons for the assertions he has made. All subjects bearing on the problems of human destiny and religion seldom fail to secure his whole-hearted interest. One sometimes wishes with all one's heart that the interest in the greatest of all the subjects that can occupy the human mind were equally keen in the Old World.

THE IDEAL PRIEST.

There is, I suppose, no Catholic who does not carry in his heart and mind some picture of what he regards as the ideal priest. It is no doubt true that this picture is, in most instances, a vague and ill-defined one, lying deep down in the depths of the subconscious life; but it is when one meets the priest who does not in any sense correspond to one's ideal that one becomes conscious that the picture exists.

I have often in the course of my Catholic life tried to define for myself what my own ideal priest is like; but I have again and again abandoned this attempt with a distinct sense of failure and dissatisfaction, fresh experience and observation constantly rectifying and modifying my views. I have only in later years come to a clear and what I believe to be a final definition.

One is, of course, necessarily affected in such a matter by one's own temperament and religious ideals as well as by the peculiar influences which some particular priest may have exercised over one's life. Now, it seems to me that the marks and qualities which characterize the ideal priest are plainly indicated in the Holy Scriptures and may also be traced in the entire life-history of the Catholic Church throughout the centuries.

The ideal priest would seem to be the man whose character and life and the mode of whose activity are fashioned according to the pattern presented by our Divine Lord Himself and by the Apostles after Him, and who presents divine truth to the world, not so much by the correctness of his creed or by the conformation of his life and practices to certain accepted standards as by the exhibition of a *divinely-formed personality*—that personality becoming the all-constraining witness to and living proof of the truth and correctness of the creed professed. The thought is perhaps best and most forcibly expressed in the familiar formula: "Sacerdos alter Christus" (the priest another Christ).

But are we not apt in our study of this deeply interesting subject to lose sight of the great truth which underlies this pregnant statement? We read the formula in books and we repeat it in our writings and our conversation; but we seldom stop to inquire what it really means and whether we have grasped its deep import. We allow our judgment to be affected and impressed by current ideas as to the priestly life and priestly ideals, which may be good and excellent in their way, but which cannot be said to be in keeping with what the Gospels so plainly and unmistakably set forth. And my impression certainly is that one reason why the influence which the Catholic priest exercises upon the world of our day is not greater than it is is to be asscribed to this cause. We are apt to emphasize the significance of certain forms of external activity and affirmation without sufficiently realizing that these are of no great value apart from that something behind them, which distinguishes them from those of all other men and which is the all-important thing.

It is not easy to define in accurate terms in what this something exactly consists, since the fact of its presence is not conveyed to others by word of mouth or by personal example, but by a peculiar influence exercised by a certain impression which leaves upon the mind of the percipient no doubt of its existence. It is perhaps best expressed by the term *personality*. It is, at any rate, included in that term. And we may, therefore, say that the ideal priest is a man possessed of and manifesting to the world a divinely-formed and Christlike personality. He is a supernatural man: a man, in the first place, as God meant and designed him to be and as he would be to-day but for sin and the falling away from Him; and a suitably-moulded instrument, in the second place, by which God can efficiently operate upon the human soul and by which the life-forces of the supernatural order can be made to manifest themselves in the world of sense. But I will state more fully what is in my mind.

When our Lord first began to proclaim the truths of the supernatural order, He did not merely confine Himself to the bare declaration of those truths, leaving them to find their way to the hearts and minds of His hearers. The central element in all His teaching was Himself—His own marvelous and transcendental personality. It consisted in a peculiar power and influence which radiated, as it were, from that personality and constantly witnessed to the truth of the teaching conveyed.

In the very early stages of His ministry our Lord, we read, "made that twelve should be with Him,"[1] in order surely, as all the after-development shows, that they might learn that He Himself really was the Gospel, since the truths which He had come to disclose could not be disclosed merely by word of mouth, but needed the accompanying forceful and unmistakable witness of the Personality which disclosed them. And it was evidently the force of personality rather than the truths disclosed which first of all arrested the attention and wonder of the Disciples. It was through it that He secured their devotion and allegiance. It was by its means that He finally forced home to them the truths which He declared. (I am not, of course, speaking in this connection of the miraculous side of His ministry.)

---

[1] St. Mark iii., 17.

And it is here, it seems to me, where we discern the gulf which separates Christianity from all other religions. It is this purposeful preaching of truth through personality which we trace throughout the entire Gospel record. Our Lord always and everywhere identified Himself with His teaching and in some instances even pointed to Himself as illustrating the truth of that teaching. He was not a recluse, who from some hidden place cast into the world the religious system which He had constructed, leaving the discovery of Himself and of His system to chance or circumstance. He did not, with a view to guarding Himself and His truth, confine Himself to select places or to spheres of human life where it was most likely to meet with acceptance. He was, as it were, the living embodiment of the truths He taught, the force of His personality constantly playing around them and manifesting itself through them. And He consequently made no abstract pronouncements respecting the worthiness or unworthiness, in view of the truths taught, of any kind of human business or avocation, or even of any kind of human pleasure or pursuit. He moved a living truth in the world. He was to be found in the market place amongst the multitude, in the rich man's house and at the marriage supper, as well as in the Temple and the synagogue and in the company of the fallen woman. He denounced the hypocrisy of the Pharisees and chased the money-changers from the courts of the Temple, as well as commended the humble gift of the widow and rewarded the faith of the man stricken with the palsy. He frequented the company of the rulers of the Jews and of the rich, no less than that of the poor fishermen and the publicans.

And He did not merely declare to these various persons the truths which He had come to convey and then left them to make of them what they could; but He held converse with them, He explained and illustrated those truths and helped them to view them in the light of the ordinary commonplace relations of life. He weaned His Disciples, as it were, from the fatal error of conceiving of divine truth in a merely abstract and mechanical way.

I often think that a great mistake is made when certain of our

Lord's statements are interpreted as justifying or not justifying a priest's participation in some of the world's recreations or amusements. This clearly is not the primary lesson contained in any one of these statements, no explicit law or rule regarding this matter having been laid down anywhere. For it is surely not the circumstance of our Lord's presence at any particular occasion or in any particular place which is emphasized, but the *manner* in which He behaved at such places or on such occasions—what He did and said and what the impressions were which He left upon those with whom He came in contact by these means. It is the play of personailty which is exhibited to us in these various incidents and which seems to me to be the essential lesson.

Our Lord did not say: Do not go to this place or to that; do not frequent such or such a house or assembly, but "into whatsoever house you enter"[2] say so and so. "When thou art invited to a wedding,"[3] do so and so, etc., etc.

He would seem to say: Do not shun any particular place or any one particular house or assembly; but when you come to it, be careful how you act; do not hide your light under a bushel, but put it upon a candlestick; let all the world see what kind of men you are; "be wise as serpents and simple as doves,"[4] and "whether you eat or drink, or whatsoever else you do, do all to the glory of God."[5] In all cases and places, and amongst all kinds and classes of persons, acquit yourselves as "the ministers of Christ and the dispensers of the mysteries of God."[6]

All the Apostolic writings surely breathe this thought and principle. They went from place to place to convey their life-giving message; but they constantly appealed to themselves and their transformed lives as the witness to the truth of that message, and it is quite evident that the message itself would not have arrested the attention of its hearers had not this living witness constantly and everywhere accompanied it. It was the supernatural truth, as it expressed itself in the personality which it had shaped and formed, that brought the pagan world into the obedience of faith; and it is the truth, presented in this form, which can alone accomplish a similar miracle to-day.

The thought is very forcibly expressed by St. Paul in the first Epistle to the Corinthians.[7]

Some Disciples, departing from one city to another, had evidently asked for letters of commendation, such as a priest to-day would give to a member of his flock moving to some other part of the country. But the Apostle considered that they had no need of such letters, since the Disciples themselves who asked for them were his letters and the best kind of letters which he could possibly write—which could be "known and read by all men." In such living letters all the world would be able not only to read the divine message itself, but also the transforming effect which its acceptance is able to produce. "You are the Epistles of Christ," he exclaims, "ministered by us and written not with ink, but with the spirit of the living God: not in tables of stone, but in the fleshy tables of the heart."

---

[2] St. Luke x., 5.

[3] St. Luke xiv., 8.

[4] St. Matt. x., 16.

[5] I. Cor. x., 31.

[6] I. Cor. iv., 1.

[7] Chapter iii.

It is indeed a happy simile which the Apostle has chosen in order to express the thought which is in his mind. And that the age in which the Apostle wrote needed just this kind of living witness and evidence few of us will be inclined to doubt. Nothing less than it was in the least likely to impress it. Philosophic thought and speculation had exhausted themselves. They had left the world much as they had found it. The bare presentation, therefore, of a new set of truths, declared to have been revealed, would but have been regarded by the thinkers of the day as the attempt to popularize some additional and recently-invented system of philosophy or of ethics.

The world, on the other hand, had learned to distrust and even to despise certain external acts and practices, such as long prayers and bodily mortifications. It knew only too well that they did not stand in any *necessary* relation to nobility of character and aim and to a really good and virtuous life. Something altogether different was needed to impress a world which had wandered far from God. What did impress that world, and in the course of time turn it upside down, was the appearance of men exhibiting no eccentricities, but living a simple, ordinary life, yet a life utterly changed and transformed, whose meanest act and duty was conformed to some lofty standard and in whose every manifestation the world could trace some transcendental aim or purpose.

The needs of the present age, it seems to me, are very similar in character. I doubt very much whether *anything* is likely forcibly and permanently to impress it in the Christward direction, except the exhibition of a really Christlike and supernatural personality. All other methods are manifestly imperfect and inadequate and have been attended by comparative failure. Most thoughtful men are interested in religious controversy, and some of us have read extensively on the subject. But it seems to me that we have almost reached the end of religious controversy. That large class of men who are committed to no creed, but who are following the movements of human thought and are perhaps vaguely searching after truth take little if any interest in it. They look upon the strife of creeds with a kind of contempt. They have a sort of feeling that along those lines the difficulties are endless and that no tangible result is likely to be reached. They are content to leave these matters to the theologians. The difficulties and problems perplexing their minds are far deeper and more fundamental than all this. Does God exist? they ask. Has a revelation been given? Is Christianity that revelation? What finally is the incontrovertible evidence that *any* form of Christian doctrine is true and is from God? The best of men, claiming to hold the most correct creed and to believe in the supernatural, are negativing their beliefs by their lives. They are chasing after worldly and temporal possessions and distinctions. They exhibit little if any conformity to the ideal which they proclaim. That ideal seems to have little influence upon their conduct and character and upon the manner in which they deal with their fellow-men. Their creed, in spite of its correctness, appears to have left them much as they were. Where, therefore, ultimately is the real evidence for the truth of their belief and of Christianity?

Again, it is pointed out to us times without number that there are numerous persons in our midst who claim to be living the supernatural life and who are very diligent in their attendance at religious services and functions. They obey the letter of the law, say many prayers and conform to many prescribed rules, yet their character and conduct are little changed. They do things in much the same way in which other and so-called irreligious people do them. They talk scandal and gossip and abuse their neighbors like them and show little inclination to make real sacrifices for their humbler and less fortunate fellows. Their many prayers and their diligent use of the sacraments do not seem to even sweeten their tempers—to make them less irritable and bitter and aggravating.

Where are the saints of whom we read in the history of the Church, the men and women who, for the sake of the supernatural truths which they hold, are prepared to strip themselves of all and to surrender all for Christ's sake?

I am thus not speaking of a state of things as it can in fairness be said to actually exist in the Catholic sphere. I am formulating phrases and expressions which reach one's ear incessantly as one moves about amongst men in the larger world. Whether quite justified or not, they are most certainly expressive of the impressions which this larger world has formed and is forming from what it sees and observes. They would seem to point to the circumstance that something is wrong somewhere, and that in the presentation of Christian truth or in the exhibition of the Christian life some great principle or element is being left out or set aside. And may it not be that it is just the setting aside or forgetting of this principle which is responsible for the indifference of the great multitude to spiritual truth to-day?

For the Catholic it is, of course, of the utmost importance that his creed should be correct, expressing as it does not what his fancy selects, but what God has revealed. He must hold and profess it in its integrity and fulness, so that his right relation to God and to the supernatural order may be maintained. He cannot *under any circumstances* make concessions or compromises with respect to anything that the Church has authoritatively declared. He must be earnest and conscientious in the defense of the truth of his creed.

And it is equally certain that the spiritual life of his soul cannot be maintained without the diligent use of the sacraments, without much and earnest prayer and an employment of all those numerous aids and observances which the Church has ordained and sanctioned with a view to binding the soul to the supernatural order.

But are we not sometimes in danger of forgetting that both the holding of a correct creed and the use of the sacraments are, after all, not ends in themselves, but means to an end, that end being the sanctification of the soul and the conforming of the character as well as of the life to the pattern presented by Christ? Do we not often make the means the end and as a consequence present Catholicism to the world in a form which is bizarre and unattractive and which we cannot in reason expect the world to embrace and accept?

The Catholicism which ultimately reduces itself to a mere attitude of thought, however correct, or to a series of external observances and practices, however good in themselves, has nothing in it to arrest the attention or interest of the modern mind and may in the end hinder the Catholic cause rather than advance and promote it.

I am inclined to think that painful experiences in the matter of the religious life have made that world exceedingly cautious and critical, causing it to distrust every form of religious manifestation, which does not express itself in a radical transformation of character and in a life involving manifest self-discipline and self-control, real visible sacrifices and surrenders in the temporal order and the building up of a personality which is radically different from that which is constructed and exhibited by the world.

And I am certain that it is that priest alone who holds fast this ideal, in the realization of which he becomes the "alter Christus," reflecting and perpetuating the personality of Christ and the new humanity created by Him, who is the priest that effectively and incisively influences the people of the time in which we live.

It is remarkable how strangely this principle is sometimes left out of sight by the very best of men who, while officially setting before the world the true Christian ideal, seem to be quite unconscious of their own inconsistencies and of the circumstance that they are presenting to the world a mere caricature of that ideal.

It is often brought as a charge against us Catholics, for instance, that some of our clergy are brusque and discourteous and that they lack many of those characteristics which graced the Saviour, their Master. We have to admit that this charge is sometimes well-founded. One does meet this type of priest in all parts of the world, and one wonders how they square their manners with the principle which they proclaim and profess to believe. Have they not, moreover, embraced a state of life which is supposed to place them a good many degrees *above* the level of the ordinary mortal? Such priests are unhappily often quite unconscious of the unfavorable impression which they are making upon the non-Catholic mind and of the harm which they are doing to the cause of Christ in the world.

I have sometimes been amused at the manner in which the fellow-priests of such an ill-mannered divine are apt to deal with this difficulty and at the effort which they make to hide the unpleasant fact from themselves and others. They will tell one "that the good father's manner must not be taken seriously." "He is in reality a very excellent and well-meaning man—is, in fact, quite a saint." "He is strenuously seeking to hide this fact from the world," etc., etc.

It does not seem to occur to those who say these things that they are but aggravating the case, since an habitually rough and discourteous person, whether he be priest or layman, can never by any chance be a saint, seeing that he is offending against a fundamental law of the Gospel and is daily exhibiting the contrast between himself and his Divine Master. It is not necessary to quote Scripture in confirmation of what I am saying; our very instincts as Christians determine such a matter for us.

I am not, of course, speaking of that state of mind, that irritation and annoyance to which we are all subject, but of a formed habit and a chronic display of ill humor—of that tendency to let oneself go and to forget those obligations to which the Christian, but the priest in particular, is pledged.

This, it may be said, is, after all, a very small matter. But it is only apparently so. Judging it by its effects, it is a very great matter indeed, great enough, in any case, to undo the better part of the good work which a priest may be doing and to neutralize the influence which he may be exercising upon his people. I am speaking of what I know from actual experience. I know, moreover, from intercourse with the Catholic clergy that I have the best of them with me in what I am saying.

It is remarkable how very seriously the simple and uneducated masses, who seem to be guided by a kind of instinct rather than by deliberate thought and reflection, are affected by this kind of thing. They positively shrink from religion when it presents itself to them in this unsavory form, this contradiction between the faith professed and the character and disposition displayed. They have very little respect for the flagrantly inconsistent Christian.

There is a charming American novel entitled "The Virginian," the hero of which is a man who possesses a wonderful power of seeing things as they are and who judges of them by a natural and unperverted standard. "I'll tell you this," says he. "A middlin' doctor is a pore thing and a middlin' lawyer is a pore thing; but keep me from a middlin' man o' God!" There are, I know, many Catholics who will heartily endorse this statement of the Virginian.

It seems to me, then, that it is in this direction, to the truly ideal, the apostolic priest, that we must look for the real power in the Church of God to-day—for the setting in motion of those life-forces which radiate from the sacred person of Jesus Christ and which alone can restore joy and gladness to a sorrow and sin-stricken world.

Books and documents may convey to us the record of the external events of the work of redemption—their influence upon the world and on other human lives; gorgeous temples and the works of men's hands may vividly express how fervently nations and individuals have believed; the charm of oratory may fascinate the mind and tend to dispose the heart. But what are they compared with the living witness to the truth of the Gospel as it is displayed in the personal life and in the personal influence of the man on whose heart and soul Christ has engraved His message and His image, with the priest who is in deed and in truth "another Christ!"

We have—thank God!—many priests in the Church of God to-day who are thus bearing engraved upon them the lineaments of their Master, and in whose presence the soul is elevated and constrained and brought nearer to God. Such priests are God's best and noblest gifts to man, for they are not only the bearers of the divine message, but they are also its witnesses, and there radiates from their persons something of that magic power which radiated from the person of the Redeemer. They bring into life something of the world unseen of that divine atmosphere in which the soul senses the things that are eternal.

It is the breathing of this atmosphere, the conscious contact with the eternal through personality, the *living* evidence of the transforming power of the Catholic religion, which is, in my opinion, the kind of evidence most calculated to convince the modern world that our religion is true and that it has God for its author.

J. GODFREY RAUPERT.

London, England.

A SUMMER TOUR OF BRITISH AMERICA.

AN expatriated Genoese, John (Giovanni) Cabot, sailed from his English home of Bristol in 1497 and cast anchor, as stated by some historians, in the vicinity of Cape Breton Island, Province of Nova Scotia, and by other writers near Labrador or Newfoundland; but it remained for Jacques Cartier, in 1534, to place upon the vast territory above us the name of Canada, derived from "kanata," the Indian interpretation of which means a village. The French adventurer immediately unfurled the Gallic ensign, and it flew aloft until 1759, when the British, under the leadership of General Wolfe, decisively defeated Montcalm on the Plains of Abraham, a short distance from the city of Quebec, the Englishman dying in action, the French leader on the succeeding day. Reaching 3,500 miles from coast to coast, 1,400 miles from north to south, fully one-fourth of this vast area of 3,700,000 square miles (about the size of Europe) lies within the frigid zone, and is therefore not suitable for permanent habitation; but it is quite fallacious to assume that Canada as a whole is a mound of perpetual snow. Indeed, Ottawa, the capital, and Montreal, the metropolis, are far below our own northwestern line of demarkation, and an army of men are now driving steel highways five hundred miles above Washington, Montana and Idaho. Seven and one-half million people, many of them Americans, find climatic conditions generally healthy—warm and pleasant in summer, cold and dry during the winter solstice; let us recall that the British Isles are in the same latitude as "inhospitable Labrador." International commerce of $800,000,000 and bank deposits of over $1,000,000,000 lively attest the energy and thrift of our cousins beyond the border; to these figures should be added 26,000 miles of railroad, valued at about $1,600,000,000. Our destination was Montreal, but the vacation period presented an opportunity to travel via Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, swinging leisurely down the St. Lawrence to the ancient and modern city of Quebec.

The 570-mile sail from New York to Halifax consumes about two days, and after passing York Redoubt and the Spion Kop fortifications at the entrance of the island-dotted harbor, tourists find the town to be quite English in many ways, for a large percentage of its people are of transplanted stock, though the Gallic race and the ubiquitous Celt are well represented. Built on the slope of an isthmus, the city reaches up to the Citadel, erected by the Duke of Kent (Queen Victoria's father) one hundred years ago, and when it is understood that the "Canadian Cronstadt" contains less than 50,000 souls, we should not be too censorious in our estimate of the Maritime capital. It is perfectly true that soft coal has cast its stamp upon the community, nor can it be denied that the frame habitations of the working classes (many of the older buildings are constructed entirely of wood) might be vastly improved by a few coats of light-colored paint; but ancient English ideas are deep-rooted, and it may be many years ere the Haligonians are fully abreast of modern customs. However, plans involving the expenditure of fifty million dollars are now under way for improvements of various kinds, chief of which is a handsome transcontinental railway station, as trains will soon be running from the far-distant Prince Rupert, British Columbia, to this "Gibraltar of the West." Tram car lines take the visitor to every point of interest, amongst which should be noted the Open Air Market, where twice a week we find the last remnants of the old-time Micmacs, who were converted by the French missionaries in the sixteenth century, displaying their products side by side with Negro farmers and the thrifty agriculturists of Gallic origin; mention may also be made of the beautiful Public Gardens, and a fine sweep of the ocean is had from the lofty Citadel towering above the town. It is an agreeable sight to watch the gaily-garbed soldiers of His Britannic Majesty march to finely-constructed All Saints' Anglican Cathedral and St. Mary's Cathedral, two of the forty churches in the city, which is not at all bad when the faithful, who comprise one-third of the populace, possess but four edifices. Dalhousie University is the principal seat of learning, and it is stated that St. Mary's College is preparing to erect several buildings, which will make it the equal of any institution in that section of the country. The Sacred Heart and Mount St. Vincent Convents are the most prominent female seminaries; Holy Cross Cemetery is noted as being the sleeping place of that distinguished convert and statesman, Right Hon. Sir John S. D. Thompson, one-time Premier of Canada. Several of the public buildings are of dignified mien, but are most sadly in need of an exterior rehabilitation. While the town is pronouncedly British, successful efforts have been made to introduce American customs, and perhaps this is one reason why some shops and office buildings are of modern design. Reveilles and bugle calls are the order of the day in this so-called impregnable city, and at every turn we meet red-jacketed, brass-buttoned gentry, with accents not unknown to the Embankment along the Thames, whose tiny little caps always seem to be falling from their skulls as they haughtily strut along Argyll and Duke streets, as if parading the might of their English monarch; then a full-panoplied warrior looms to view, caparisoned in all the habiliments and accoutrements germane to Balaclava and Ladysmith, whose clanking sword and awe-engendering headgear at first strike terror to the hearts of unsophisticated travelers; but these dress-parade heroes of 'Arriet's heart are as innocuous as a five-year-old dreadnought and hugely enjoy the admiring glances cast upon them by the fair American tourists. Of course, the opulent ones have deemed it necessary to emulate their kinsmen beyond the seas, so we find high gates and towering fences surrounding some homes of the aristocracy. A boast is made that the large and magnificent Bedford Basin, which is frequently the scene of many animated regattas, can hold all the cruisers and men-of-war of the imperial navy, and it is officially recorded that ten thousand big and little ships arrive and depart annually from the numerous well-ordered docks along the shore. Halifax is a port of call for vessels in need of fuel, "New Scotland" raising to the surface some 7,000,000 tons of soft coal yearly, or over fifty per cent. of the entire Dominion; iron, copper and gypsum are also extensively mined. Manufactures are rapidly forging to the front, being valued at over $70,000,000 every twelve months. Fishing is also the pastime of 25,000 "Scotians," who have $5,000,000 invested in nearly 1,000 smacks, results annually reaching upwards of $12,000,000; archaic vessels are gradually being superseded by modern gasoline motorboats, which are proving quite beneficial to both fishermen and fish market. Farming assists very materially in aiding the people to thrive, the entire value of lands and products in 1912 being placed at $147,000,000. Fruit growing has been brought to a high state of development in the Province, apple orchards alone exporting some 2,000,000 barrels to England; and when it is known that a vast array of sightseers frequently throng the handsome Hotel Halifax and other inns, it is understood why the half-million people of this land twice the size of Belgium, enjoying absolute political and religious liberty, are as happy as those of other nations.

Cautious hands directed the English Exchequer in the olden days, for the entry, "To hym who founde the New Isle, 10 Pounds," appears in the early history of Newfoundland—perhaps for the purpose of allowing Cabot to build another flotilla of caravels to plant the Union Jack on other regions of the unknown world toward the west; but if the able Italian mariner was not fairly reimbursed for his explorations, those who visit "Terra Nova" during the summer season are benefited in many ways. St. John's is about 550 miles northeast of Halifax, and at sunrise of the third day the "ship" was flashing tiny opera glasses and powerful binoculars on the distant cliffs rising sharply from the ocean's floor. As seaborne travelers know, it is difficult to distinguish between clouds and islands when the air is misty, and, of course, several heavy wagers of cigars and sweets were made that the gray-clad promontory dead ahead was merely a heavy Newfoundland fog, while several world-girdlers prophesied that it was in reality the first colony upon which was planted the flag of England; but as the screws drove us on at top speed across the Banks, we had all been quite positive in the beginning that any one should have known the rocky fortress was none other than the "Norway of the West" itself. We were prepared to view precipitous steeps and gorgeous barricades equal to the storm-ravaged terraces of the Scandinavian coast, and as the engines slowed down to take aboard the husky pilot, there towered immediately above our larboard side a series of gigantic cliffs that seemed to pierce the firmament on high; but still no human habitation was perceptible to our vision. And to the right a hundred grotesque, red-sailed smacks were busily engaged in hauling from the deep codfish and crustaceans of many varieties, amounting to $12,000,000 yearly and ranging from herring to whales, the latter numbering perhaps 500 and frequently exceeding seventy feet in length; fine specimens of the cod are occasionally brought ashore measuring nearly six feet and weighing about sixty pounds. A little later we discern the lofty Cabot Tower, and a swing to the left brings to view a great aperture in the rocky barricade they call "The Narrows"—and now we are steaming along to the metropolis of Newfoundland, named in honor of St. John the Baptist. The hardy men who spend their lives on the undulating waves of the North Atlantic go out to the sea in dories and sixty-tonners, and all with the laudable desire to maintain the 250,000 folks left on terra firma; after many days they return to unload their haul, and quite a few to spend a night or so in the whitewashed cottages that cling to the cliffs encircling the bay. Perhaps the lofty homes of these "cliff-dwellers" are not as gaudy as those of our *nouveau riche,* but their altitudinous humility is suffused with an air of coziness not germane to many mansions of the noble. When springtime arrives, the greatest sealing fleet on the globe leaves the bay for the Arctic seas, to eventually bring back a hundred thousand pelts, valued at nearly $1,000,000; from this northernmost city on the Atlantic coast start explorers bound for the frozen wastes above. As illustrating the enormous "catch" yearly brought into the harbor, it is stated that not less than *two hundred million* cod are annually hauled up from the Atlantic's bed, the bulk being consigned to seafood merchants in St. John's.

It would be hyperbole to compare St. John's with a Seattle or a Calgary, the ancient town still retaining many idiosyncrasies characteristic of a distant era; every one seems contented with life, and the cry of "there's millions in it" has not as yet invested the gigantic bastion hurled skyward from Neptune's home. Religion has a deep interest for the populace, Methodist and Presbyterian churches being numerous, and the Anglican Cathedral (costing $750,000) is a handsome edifice; but the principal building of the island is St. John's Catholic Cathedral, which, together with St. Bonaventure's College, towers above the hilly metropolis. To the rear of the great sanctuary, which is said to seat between seven and eight thousand people, are the homes of those of exalted social station, the luscious cod, rich timber and mineral lands having created an élite of superior rank. The capital has its well-equipped theatre, rich-appearing homes, homes not so elaborate, an electric trolley system, moving-picture halls and fine office buildings, while on busy Water street are found numerous business houses and shops of modern style; indeed, from the harbor, which bears a striking resemblance to New York Bay, the sightseer considers the seat of legislation to possess more than 35,000 souls. The town boasts one good hotel, and very fair accommodations may be had for $2.50 per day at inns that make the epicure a gourmand as he partakes of the various courses of aquatic products prepared by the cunning hand of a Newfoundland *chef*. Peculiar-talking jehus are familiar with all the interesting spots and driveways leading to Outer Cove or Torbay, and it may remove a doubt by stating that several of the well-kept country lanes are as charming of vista the most æsthetic eye might wish to view; nor should it be thought that all the islanders are a good-natured but bad-mannered people. Indeed, the majority are as intelligent and refined as the residents of any community in the States; in fact, it would be somewhat inconsistent if it were otherwise, for the "Half-way House of the Atlantic" is daily and nightly flooded with tons of those mysterious dots and dashes the nine cable stations draw from fathomless depths that wash the boundaries of many lands. Independence is also a striking characteristic of the populace, and this is one of several reasons why they have steadfastly refused to consolidate with the Canadian Confederation, which event occurred in 1867. In religious affairs Catholics lead the island with 80,000, Anglicans 75,000, Methodists 62,000, "others" 11,000. Schools are supported by the

State, the Christian Brothers maintaining St. Bonaventure's College, the Sisters of Mercy conducting St. Bride's Academy.

Unfortunates addicted to the reprehensible use of alcoholic beverages will find it advisable to prepare themselves in advance, for "public houses" are but little frequented by the abstemious residents, who have enacted a drastic rule to the effect that liquors shall only be dispensed between the hours of 9 A. M. and 6 P. M.—a drastic rule that would prove highly beneficial to human society in other sections of the earth.

Men who worship at the shrine of the early fathers are now prominent politically, socially and materially, but in 1757 Governor Edwards, a very pious son of the Anglican Church, and one of the ablest financiers of his time, needed money to complete the Episcopalian edifice, so he issued this order to the magistrates: "Whereas, the church in this place has been carried on by the subscription of *well-disposed Christians,* and it being highly necessary that it should be covered in as soon as possible, you are therefore required and hereby directed to cause the *evil-disposed persons* mentioned in the margin to repair to work to the 4th of Nov. next, as it appears that they are livers in this place who have not subscribed, or to cause them to go to work till that time." His Excellency's method of building the church was simple, direct and efficient, for the Nonconformists, Catholics, Jews and "livers" in general were to be incarcerated in an iniquitous institution styled a "gaol" if they meditated regarding their immediate line of procedure.

Saxon blood is still predominant, but the peregrinating Celt has long been known to "Terra Nova," and he has succeeded in breaking down the insularity of other days, with the result that the growing Church of Rome enjoys the respect and esteem of men professing various creeds. In 1907 Sir Edward Patrick Morris (the first Catholic to hold the position in fifty years) was elected to the Premiership, and during his tenure of office many improvements have been inaugurated for the well-being of the colony; in fact, it is generally conceded that he and Sir Robert Reid, the railroad and steamship magnate, are the ablest men the island has yet produced.

When Newfoundlanders were of lesser rank, they delighted in the ancient cognomina bestowed upon various places, but prosperity and education have somewhat transformed their ideas of things, and now we find Archbishop Howley, who has Suffragans in Harbor Grace and St. George's, acting as chairman of the Nomenclature Board, and his perspicacity has transmuted Dark Tickle to Brighton, Cat's Cove to Avondale, Dog Bay to Horwood and Ragged Harbor to fragrant Melrose. His Grace for the nonce holds in abeyance decisions regarding Blow-Me-Down, Cock and Hen Cove, Come-by-chance, Dead Lobster Bay, Pat Powers Cove and several other embryo cities on the list of the Postmaster General of old Newfoundland. Though sunstroke is somewhat extraneous to the home of the "Bankers" during the season the auriferous orb is beaming on Magellan Strait, it is a grievous mistake to regard the island as merely the habitat of the polar bear. Winters are cold, but not too severe for comfort, and the natives find many diversions to while away their evening leisure. Ice hockey and skating are favorite pastimes, and caribou hunting is familiar to many of the inhabitants. When Old Sol comes north, the weather is delightful, long diurnal hours allowing open-air games until two hours ere the silver-throated chimes announce the birth of another morn; for it should not be forgotten that in this northern latitude the sovereign luminary does not slip beyond the western circle until 8 o'clock; then comes an hour of twilight, and perchance those empurpled phantoms whose rendezvous lies many leagues beyond the glaciers of Labrador may deign to emblazon the supernal bay with those golden shafts of "merry dancers" no mundane pen, no grandiloquent tongue can well portray—the auroral precursor of another day.

Harbor Grace (population 5,000) is an anti-strenuous city on Conception Bay; no one has ever been known to die of heart disease, though the town contains a couple of small shoe factories, two oil plants, four churches, cliffs that should inspire the soul of Poe or Daly, two cable landings, quaint cottages and quainter natives, while the roads and lakes roundabout make one resolve to return when the heart and body of man are languid from the hurly-burly assiduity of modern life. The 26,000 Catholics of the diocese are ably directed from an attractive cathedral by His Lordship Bishop John March.

Curious people have often inquired why the various species of fish congregate in such large numbers around the shores of this little-known, much-maligned, self-governing colony, one-third larger than the Emerald Isle. Those who follow the sea assert that the answer is found in the presence of myriads of jellyfish, those most peculiar "sea-nettles," as our friend Aristotle was wont to call the enriching provender of aquatic animals of predaceous mould. Of course, finnyfolk in general, and codfish in particular, is the mainstay of the people, many of whom are engaged in salting and drying the product for export to Catholic countries; but agriculture is looming up of late years, while mineral and timber lands are also undergoing great development. Lord Northcliffe, the English publisher, has invested $6,000,000 in the Grand Falls paper mills, driven by water power and said to be the most modern in the world. Over 200 tons are daily produced and shipped by the company's railroad to

Botwood, to be later laid down in London twenty-five per cent. cheaper than it can be secured elsewhere, for it will be recalled that St. John's is only 2,000 miles from the British metropolis. It is also interesting to note that 10,000,000 feet of lumber is yearly shipped to other lands, much of it going to erect the cities of far-distant Argentina, 7,000 miles to the south. Reid's Newfoundland Railway was put into operation in 1881, and from that year may be dated the development of the country's treasures. The trunk line runs far to the north, then zigzags down to Port aux Basques, 550 miles to the west; the sleepers are superior to those of Europe, while the parlor cars and dining service are equal to the best on the English lines; various branches bring the trackage up to 1,000 miles. Much of the scenery along the route is of a wild and charming nature, and here and there are seen many well-tilled and prosperous-looking plantations. Indeed, the army of tourists who yearly come to visit the gorgeous prospects by land and sea are quickly disillusioned of prejudices long entertained of this isolated empire now preparing to take its place among the nations of the world.

Sightseers will enjoy a day or two at Port aux Basques, a rapturous spot where the Vikings of old made their habitat. Surrounded by tall and captivating hills, the rock-rimmed basin, with its fiords and trawlers, cozy little cottages and quiet-spoken natives, reminds the visitor of those wave-lashed coves along the Trondheim coast. Moreover, the residents are a happy group of mortals, kindly of nature and devoid of those frills and furbelows prevailing in lands not remote.

"As bleak as Labrador" is familiar to every schoolboy, who imagines Newfoundland's dependency to be perennially surrounded by walrus and towering icebergs. The resident population numbers 4,000 "livyers" (live heres), but this is augmented every summer by 15,000 fisherfolk—men, women and children—who return in the fall with 1,200 schooners loaded to the rails with cod of various sizes. The world has probably nothing so unique as this annual migration of these Newfoundland anglers to Labrador. In the merry month of May they close their cottages, pack their chattels aboard their floating habitations and proceed to spend a vacation in the northland; in September they return to the fatherland. Labrador is now chiefly noted for its fisheries and scenery, but geologists assert that minerals of many strata are lodged in its subterranean vaults; in fact, several experts have placed themselves on record as saying that a future generation will find precious ore in sufficient abundance to make it rank as one of the great gold fields of the world. Sir William MacGregor traveled far and wide in this unknown land, and states that the timber area is practically inexhaustible. At one lumber camp the mill was handling trees seven feet in circumference and containing as high as 240 rings; this means that the trees in question were perhaps 240 years old. Dr. Grenfell, of the Deep Sea Mission, proclaims the scenery along the coast as equal to the famous fiords of Norway.

When we crossed Cabot Strait to North Sydney, Cape Breton, a twin-screw steamer rushed eastward in a frenzied haste to England. Treacherous bergs or misty palls, little dories or largest trawlers were but picayunes in the path of this proud annihilator of space and time—and then we understood why countless anguished hearts and fatherless children in the vicinity of the Grand Banks cry out for a cessation of this maddened flight across the fishing grounds of Newfoundland. What a vast array of noble, weather-beaten men have been consigned to gruesome, unhallowed tombs—to save a few tons of coal and a few hours of time!

Innumerable deep-sea fishing smacks were passed all the way up to Anticosti Island, at which point began the 300-mile sail along the St. Lawrence, skirted on the south by the Notre Dame Mountains and on the north by the rugged Laurentian Range. A stiff northwester sent the whitecaps tumbling in all directions as the retrospective mind involuntarily paused to honor the memories of those dauntless navigators, the French Cartier and the Italian Cabot, who braved those treacherous reefs two hundred years before George Washington was born—and in little sixty-tonners a few feet longer than a modern lifeboat. Stadacona, as Quebec was known to the Indians, is a good-sized city of 80,000 people, and has made much progress in recent years. It now contains many small factories and is also a prominent port of call for various lines of steamers; tourists materially assist in making the natives opulent. Quebec has the distinction of being the oldest bishopric north of Mexico, having been erected in 1674; the first Bishop was François de Montmorency Laval. Originally the diocese embraced all of Canada and about half of the United States. Church properties are insured in an archdiocesan institution to the extent of $8,000,000; the vast bulk of the people profess the ancient creed, but all denominations receive an equal division of the school funds. Laval University (founded in 1663) is a massive structure six stories high, and has the reputation of having graduated more famous men than any other college in the realm; female academies are also plentiful in the city; the Ursuline Nuns were the first Sisters to found a noble charity on Canadian soil, the Hôtel Dieu, begun under the superiorship of Mme. de la Peltrie in 1637.

Of course, every community proclaims its unrivaled attractions in glowing phrase, but Quebec is perhaps the one and only spot beneath the skies that transports the sightseer from the sixteenth to the twentieth century within the twinkling of an eye. Divided into two parts, the Upper Town and the Lower Town, we behold from the heights of the stupendous cliff (180 feet deep) the unique and picturesque houses and passages of the little habitations that first saw the light when Samuel de Champlain and his Gallic associates founded the quaint and curious place in 1608; from broad and lengthy Dufferin Terrace the tourist looks down on a labyrinth of alleyways which for the sake of courtesy are known as streets; then we gaze upon the single spire of the humble Chapel of Notre Dame des Victoires, built in 1688, and as we turn there soar heavenward the outlines of a vast and majestic basilica; a limousine of regal make rolls swiftly along the well-kept boulevard, and down below we see the ancients of old Rouen sitting and chatting at the feudal doorways; slowly drifting towards the town, her sails lazily flapping in answer to the gentle breeze, we descry a galleon of Norman build, and gracefully plowing the placid waters, her giant funnels belching skyward vast plumes of jet, a great leviathan speeds onward to the Atlantic lane; to the left the gorgeous Chateau Frontenac haughtily surveys the grandeur of the Laurentian Hills and the breakers that roll perennially toward the east, then we view the microscopic inn of the mediæval age; on the Citadel above us glistening but gruesome guns stand prepared to fling far and wide their shells and shrapnel; from the depths of the great escarpment ascend the echoes of some old rhyme sung in the distant long ago.

Such is the ancient and modern city of Quebec; but the antiquary would view with grave consternation the horseless vehicles and electric cars that roll so incongruously along the highways of this most antique relic of another age. It is indeed a noble prospect, for as the glass sweeps up and down and across the buoyant stream, we scan a panorama difficult for a human pen to faithfully describe. In the Lower Town are found the banks and places of general business, and, of course, the humble but honest proletariat; in the Upper Town dignified statesmen formulate the laws for the Province in a handsome House of Parliament that was built and furnished by architects and artisans of local fame; and along the sides of Grande Allee there repose palatial homes of the proudest patricians of all the land—a land that speaks the tongue of France while gazing at the English ensign flapping from the halyard above. Of course, in order to be truly archaic, the natives deemed it imperative to erect two exquisitely designed "gates" similar to those in vogue in fallen empires, and both archways, "Kent Gate" and "St. Louis Gate," lend an air of mediævalism to the surroundings that makes it less difficult for the visitor to imagine himself viewing a portal in some dead and buried empire of the old régime.

Perhaps Robespierre was not a very saintly personage, but he proved a kindly benefactor to the metropolitan church, for herein are found a group of noble paintings, among them "The Christ of the Cathedral," by Van Dyke, and the "Ecstasy of St. Paul," by Maratti, smuggled away from France to escape incineration during the animated days of the Revolution, when to believe in God was a treason that called for decapitation. It is a recognized fact that cynics frequently accompany the 100,000 pilgrims who annually visit the Shrine of St. Anne de Beaupré, patron saint of Canada, but there seems to be irrefragable evidence to substantiate many marvelous cures rendered through the intercession of the holy saint. Inside the entrance of the new and beautiful edifice we find countless crutches and braces left by those whose ailments have undergone improvement and perhaps have been entirely cured. Twenty miles east of Quebec and reached by electric cars, the sacred spot has an interesting history. A few years after the founding of Quebec, a crew of Breton sailors, buffeted around by a wicked storm, vowed to build a shrine in honor of St. Anne should she guide them to safety. After landing at the site where now stands the handsome basilica, they built a modest little chapel in fulfillment of their promise. In 1660 it became necessary to rebuild the primitive edifice; in 1670 the Chapter of Carcassone, France, sent out a relic of St. Anne, to be kept in the new shrine. Rich presents have come from the Court of Louis XIV., and the Queen Mother, Anne of Austria, embroidered a chasuble for the service of St. Anne's new altar; in 1889 Cardinal Taschereau consecrated the present church, now in charge of the Redemptorist Fathers.

The Province of Quebec covers 230,000 square miles (over twice the size of Italy) and contains a population of 2,100,000, the increase of 21 per cent. in ten years being almost entirely due to the very high birth rate, families of twelve children being common; Catholics claim 85 per cent. of the inhabitants; it should also be understood that 10,000 French-Canadians annually emigrate to the United States and the Far Western Provinces. Immense forests are found in the northern section, and mining products last year totaled upward of $15,000,000; the asbestos mines are amongst the most productive on the globe; the fisheries are a very important asset, but agriculture is the principal mainstay of the people. Fourteen divorces have been recorded in the Province since 1906. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, one of the world's foremost statesmen, Premier from 1896 to 1911, is a native of Arthabaska.

For some reason not intelligently explained, the river trip to

Montreal (180 miles) may be made only at night, and we at first regretted the necessity of entraining for Montreal; but after crossing to Lévis, on the southern bank, the picturesqueness of Quebec looms high above us in all its grandeur. We leave on the Government-owned Intercolonial Railway, and from time to time have an opportunity of learning how and why the *habitants* (as they call the French-Canadians) manage to bring up very large families and acquire much material prosperity. A century ago, let us say, a farmer became possessed of 100 acres; at his death the ground was equally divided among his children; in turn, each child subdivided his holdings among his offspring; and this is why we find so many lengthy strips of land, together with comfortable cottages, on either side of the track. Some of these plots may be only 500 feet wide and 1,000 feet deep, but they are intelligently worked and little is allowed to remain idle. In a word, the *habitant* is as loyal to his farm as he is to his faith, while his good wife counts her young ones by the dozen—a slight contrast with conditions obtaining in the former home of these healthy, virile people.

When in 1535 Jacques Cartier first gazed at the eminence towering above the island of Hochelaga, upon which stands the flourishing metropolis of Canada, he named it "Mont Royal," in due time to be debased to Montreal; and even if the voyagers did not have at their disposal the inclined railway that ascends the hill to-day, they were well rewarded for their arduous climb of 1,000 feet to the apex as they scanned the strange and primitive huts of the aborigines, the bending landscape of the island and the intrepid Indian daring death as he skilfully swung his shell-like bark down the boiling vortex of the Lachine Rapids. In those days the whites and reds swapped their wares while fondling the ramrod and the bow, and it is a matter of history that the Iroquois and Mohawks greatly perturbed the equanimity of the explorers; let us not forget, however, that all these chronologies were penned by men of Caucasian blood. "Canada's Gateway" contains 500,000 inhabitants, and a week could be spent with profit in visiting the various points of interest. The home of the ubiquitous La Salle is still in evidence down at Lachine, and, so it is stated, he declared it to be the way to China; this is why it is styled "a la Chine." All banks of national importance are represented in the financial district, and these institutions are generally of costly and dignified appearance; Victoria Square, St. James' street and the Place d'Armes are lined with handsome buildings; department stores are up-to-date and the street car system takes the visitor to several interesting communities on the outskirts of the city. The Royal Victoria Hospital, costing $2,000,000, is one of the most beautiful and most richly endowed institutions in the world; the Grey Nuns have been conducting a very large hospital since 1755, while the Hôtel Dieu (inaugurated in 1644) is an immense structure and contains over 400 beds; McGill University and the Royal Victoria College for women are noble Protestant seminaries; Laval University has a large and substantial branch here; St. James' Cathedral, on Dominion Square, is modeled along the lines of St. Peter's, Rome, but an untutored eye found the side walls entirely too sombre for a metropolitan church; interiorly it is a place of grandeur, the services being conducted with great dignity; statues of the Twelve Apostles surmount the façade of the edifice; $3,000,000 is said to have been expended upon its embellishment. Notre Dame is an immense sanctuary, with two galleries, and is said to seat 10,000 people, making it the largest church north of the Rio Grande; there are a score of side altars, at all of which priests may be offering up the Holy Sacrifice simultaneously; on Sunday the people move in and out the great doors like regiments of soldiers; the organ is said to be one of the finest in the world, costing $50,000, and the Chapel of the Sacred Heart, in the rear of the great basilica, contains paintings and hand-carved statuary that far surpass anything to be found on American soil. Of course, the sons of Loyola maintain two colleges and a beautiful church; the children of Erin have spent a fortune on elaborate St. Patrick's. Our separated friends are well represented, too; St. James' Methodist Church seats 3,000 people and cost $500,000; Presbyterians have several fine structures, while the Bishop of the Anglican Church presides over a small but attractive cathedral. Hotels are numerous in the city, the principal inn, the Windsor, having few superiors in the States. On Sherbrooke street are located the substantial buildings of Montreal College, under the direction of the Sulpicians, and out toward Mount Royal we find the homes of the wealthy, and they are generally of rich design; however, there is no excuse for the thousands of "flats" which dot the municipality, land being abundant and low in price. In the older sections are the relics of other days, but the general tone of the city is modern in every respect, both languages being used, English predominating in the business district. Many visitors spend fifty cents to "shoot" the Lachine Rapids in one of the Richelieu river steamers. The trip is something out of the ordinary, and the keen-eyed navigator needs to keep cool and collected, ready at any moment to swing the flying boat clear of the treacherous boulders to the right and left; in fact, it is one grand manoeuvre from the moment we leave the pier until we roll safely beneath the span of the great Victoria Bridge, costing $8,000,000. It is nothing short of remarkable that so few accidents have occurred in the onward gallop of the foaming

"White Horse of the St. Lawrence" down this exhilarating, death-dealing declivity to his future home in the Atlantic Ocean. Montreal is displaying much sagacity in the development of manufacturing and shipping facilities, and there is good reason for believing that it is destined to become an international mart of great importance. Thanks to the curvature of the earth, Liverpool is only 3,000 miles distant; by this means products of the Far West can be placed on board light-draught ships at Port Arthur, on Lake Superior (2,400 miles from the sea), and reach Montreal at a fraction of the rates by rail for the same distance. Duluth, Chicago, Milwaukee, Cleveland and other lake ports are all accessible to the island of Hochelaga.

We Americans are justly proud of our exploits in the engineering field, but the route from Montreal to Toronto by steamer displays much ingenuity and energy on the part of our northern neighbors; and the trip is one of rare interest, for in order to clear the Lachine Rapids, we pass through the Lachine Canal (10 miles long) to the river, later making a detour about the Coteau Rapids through the Soulanges Canal (12 miles), around the Long Sault Rapids through Cornwall Canal (11 miles), and later on we steam through the Iroquois Canal and on to Prescott, at which point we change to the large steamers of the Richelieu Line, which continue on past the Thousand Islands to Toronto. From the deck we secure a bird's-eye view of an interesting landscape, dotted here and there with well-tilled farms and cozy villages of the *habitants*. All these canals are strongly constructed and operated and lighted by electric power.

At Brockville, exquisite isles of every conceivable size begin to sever the rushing waters; some are heavily wooded and some are clothed with swaying grass; charming hillocks tower above a few and cozy farms stand high on others; here and there a regal chateau flings its haughty cupola far beyond the sloping lawn, while all about us are comfortable bungalows of the well-to-do. When the sun has set, the "searchlight ramble" manoeuvres in and around an enchanting archipelago torn from the pages of the "Arabian Nights." The Thousand Islands are worth traveling far to view.

Canada buys more from the United States than from all other nations combined. In spite of tariff preferences, Britain's share of the market has steadily declined before the advance of American goods; geography has been too much for tariffs. The bulk of Canadian imports is furnished by Americans, and the United States would also take the bulk of the exports except that our friends have little to sell that we do not produce, and we require Canada's exports only to relieve a shortage here. We take almost the entire output of Canadian minerals, the bulk of its forestry, over one-half of the exports of manufactures and a third of its fisheries. Britain is the principal market for its agricultural and animal products; the larger takings of Canadian wheat constitute the principal factor that makes England loom larger in exports, and the prospects are that we will take a larger proportion of this article. The Dominion is a country in the making and requires large amounts of iron work for buildings, railroads, bridges, factories and farms; the main exports from the United States to Canada consist of manufactures of iron and steel; next come coal and coke, of which our neighbors are the largest importers in the world, and purchases from this side of the border yearly amount to $41,000,000.

William S. Long.

Camden, N. J.

PAINLESS MARTYRDOM.

When thousands of our Catholic people are frequenting shows and moving pictures portraying the life and trials of the early Christians, and when this year many hundreds of Catholic pilgrims will commemorate the Peace of the Church under Constantine by visiting Rome and the tombs of the martyrs, the question must often arise in pious souls: Did the martyrs suffer very intensely? Did they all feel pain? If so, how could delicate, tender girls, even mere children, bear their trials so bravely? And if they did not feel the rack, the fire, the beasts, what softened or prevented these pangs? While unable to answer in most cases, and while ready to believe that they did often suffer keenly, yet, if accredited authors are to be trusted in this case, we may conclude that a considerable number of martyrdoms were painless, and that this preternatural fact was the effect of God's merciful grace.

And if everything supernatural arouses a special interest, surely the facts (if such they can be shown) about these painless martyrdoms cannot but be doubly so.

Now, just as most facts of Christian lore have roots, or prototypes, in the Old Testament, so with this remarkable fact of painless torture. For Daniel's account (chapter iii.) of Sidrach, Misach and Abdenago, confessors of the true God, who were not hurt by Nabuchodonosor's fiery furnace, though it was heated seven times, forms a fitting prelude to the cases of immunity from pain enjoyed later by certain Christian martyrs. That this is the true sense of Daniel's record we are taught by that early Christian codification of laws, the "Constitutions of the Holy Apostles," which says: "Let him that desires to be His disciple earnestly follow His conflicts: let him imitate His patience, knowing that even though he be burned in the fire by men, *he will suffer nothing, like the three children.*"[1]

But it is not question of such miracles as this, where the sufferers, so to speak, escaped death; nor of such as that of St. John, who is said to have suffered no harm from his bath of hot oil; nor of that of St. Boniface, who had a like treatment at Issus from Galerius and Maximimus, A. D. 307, for these all *survived* their trials. Neither do we refer to those martyrs who seemed to awe the wild beasts let loose upon them into fawning and cringing pets, as did St. Tyrannis.[2]

No, but we speak of martyrs who *suffered death,* though they seemed exempt from pain. About such "there has ever existed throughout the Church an earnest desire to learn in what frame of mind her faithful members encountered martyrdom: how they felt and acted in that solemn hour, from the mere contemplation of which our nature shrinks. We long to know—all, at least, who share the spirit of the martyrs—how faith fared when so hardly beset by sense, and what measure of infirmity adhered to the soul already standing at the gate of heaven."[3]

As St. Paul encouraged his Corinthians and wrote that "He who is faithful will not allow you to be tempted beyond that which you can bear" (I. Cor. x., 13), surely there is some special strength vouchsafed to those who enter upon the martyr conflict. Tens of thousands have lapsed at the sight of the tribunal; one or two have begged a respite from torture and gained strength to confess afresh, but of those who have been suffered to fall away after entering upon the trial the number is small indeed."[4]

But let us hear the cases in evidence of our thesis. A well-known example is that of St. Polycarp, disciple of St. John the Apostle, martyred at Smyrna about A. D. 167. The account of his martyrdom, which has come down to us as a precious heirloom, says of him and his companions: "Not one of them let a sigh or a groan escape them, thus proving to us all that those holy martyrs of Christ, at the very time when they suffered such torments, *were absent from the body,* or rather that the *Lord stood by them and communed with them.* The fire of the savage executioners appeared cool to them."[5]

There are in our Patrologies and Menologies a number of cases recording not only painless martyrdoms, but stating the *reason* why the martyrs were exempt from pain. In A. D. 202 a strong, tender "Letter of the Church at Lyons and Vienne" was sent to the Church in Asia, and Pontus, recording how "the blessed Blandina, last of all, having, as a noble mother, encouraged her children and sent them before her victorious to the king, endured herself all their conflicts and hastened after them, glad and rejoicing in her departure, as if called to a marriage supper, rather than cast to wild beasts. And after the scourging, after the wild beasts, after the roasting seat she was finally inclosed in a net and thrown before a bull. And having been tossed about by the animal, *but feeling none of the things which were happening to her, on account of her hope and firm hold upon what had been entrusted to her and her communion with Christ,* she also was sacrificed. And the heathen themselves confessed that never among them had a woman endured so many and such terrible tortures."

---

[1] Bk. V., Sec. I., par. vi.

[2] Butler, "Lives," February 20.

[3] Maitland, "Catacombs," second edition, p. 118.

[4] Maitland, "Catacombs," p. 108.

[5] "Martyrdom of Polycarp," Ch. II.

Again, half a century afterwards, under the Emperor Decius, A. D. 251, an Asiatic merchant, St. Maximus, was martyred. To Optimus, the proconsul of Asia, Maximus, being bastinadoed in his martyrdom, boldly declared: *"Neither your clubs, nor your iron hooks, nor your fire give me any pain, because the grace of Jesus Christ dwelleth in me."*[6]

Only a few years later, and in Carthage, where St. Cyprian lived and died for Christ, as did so many martyrs, a certain Flavian, who suffered A. D. 259, "in a vision asked St. Cyprian whether the stroke of death is painful, and the martyr (St. Cyprian) answered: '*The body feels no pain* when the soul gives itself wholly to God.' "[7]

If the persecutions under Decius were indeed dreadful, they were scarcely more rigorous than those which followed under Diocletian, from A. D. 284 to A. D. 306. Therein one Romanus, a deacon and exorcist of Caesarea, a native of Palestine, suffered at Antioch. He "endured with fortitude (having his tongue cut out) and showed to all by his deeds that *the Divine Power is present* with those who endure any hardship whatever for the sake of religion, lightening their suffering and strengthening their zeal . . . and *he seemed insensible to his sufferings, as if he were without flesh or body."*[8]

About the same time suffered St. Victor of Marseilles, when Jesus Christ appeared to him on the rack, and holding a cross in His hands, gave him His peace and told him that He suffered in His servants and crowned them after their victory. *These words dispelled both his pains and his grief.*[9]

---

[6] Butler's "Lives," April 30.

[7] Butler's "Lives," February 24.

[8] Eusebius, "Martyrs of Palestine," Ch. II.

[9] Butler's "Lives," July 21.

Three remarkable cases occurred in the year A. D. 304, when St. Quirinus, Bishop of Hungary, was martyred, but declared: *"I feel not the blows which my body has received; they give me no torment."*[10] Four months later the verbatim "passio" of St. Probus, who suffered before Flavius Clemens Numerianus Maximus, Governor of Celicia, tell us that when Demetrius, the centurion, applied heated bars to Probus' feet, Probus said: *"This fire is without hurt; at least I feel none."*[11]

The same year in Spain St. Vincent was roasted, and "the melted fat dripping from the flesh nourished and increased the flames, which, instead of tormenting, seemed, as St. Austin says, to give the martyr new vigor and courage, for the more he suffered the greater seemed to be the inward joy and consolation of his soul."[12]

Seven years afterwards St. Peter Balsam, a native of Palestine, suffered martyrdom, and while on the rack the people implored him: "Obey the emperors; sacrifice and rescue yourself from these torments." Peter replied: "Do you call these torments? *I, for my part, feel no pain.*"

Few martyrs are better known or held in more affectionate regard than St. Laurence and St. Agnes, yet probably not many know that of the former St. Augustine says that in comparison with the fervor with which his breast was burning the external flame of his persecutors was cold.[13] While of St. Agnes that other great doctor of the Western Church, St. Ambrose, wrote that her body, which had overcome the fires of lust, found a cool resting place in the middle of the flames.[14]

Under Julian, in the second half of the fourth century, persecutions raged. Then it was that Sallustinus, the prefect of Daphne, "arrested a young man (St. Theodore), hung him up before the world in stocks, lacerated his back with scourges and scarred his sides with claw-like instruments of torture. And this he did all day."[15] And he only released him from further punishment when he thought he could not possibly outlive the torments. Yet *God preserved* this sufferer so that he long survived that confession. Rufinus, the author of the "Ecclesiastical History," written in Latin, states that he himself conversed with the same Theodore a considerable time afterwards, and inquired of him whether in the process of scourging and racking he had not felt the most intense pains. His answer was that he felt the pain of the torture to which he was subjected for a very short time, and that a young man stood by him, who both wiped off the sweat which was produced by the acuteness of the ordeal through which he was passing and at the same time strengthened his mind, so that *he rendered this time of trial a season of rapture rather than of suffering.*[16]

---

[10] Butler's "Lives," June 4.

[11] Butler's "Lives," October 11.

[12] Butler's "Lives," January 22.

[13] See Sermon 304.

[14] Sermon 48.

[15] Theodoret's "History," Bk. III., Ch. VII.

The next year, A. D. 362, when Julian, the uncle of Julian the Apostate, was Count or Governor of the East, of which Antioch was the capital, he seized and racked Theodore. After having him stretched so that his body seemed eight feet long, Julian derided him and said: "I perceive you do not sufficiently feel your torments." The martyr replied: *"I do not feel them because God is with me."*[17]

When Julian the Apostate, A. D. 363, ordered SS. Bonosus and Maximilian to be beaten with leaded thongs three several times, and "said to the executioners, 'Exert your utmost strength; give them no respite,' *the martyrs felt not the least pain.*"[18]

In the next decade, A. D. 372, there lived in the country of the Goths a young man named Sabas, who delighted in serving about the altar in church. The son of one of the local kings, Atharidus, had Sabas arrested and tortured. "One of the slaves of Atharidus, incensed at the words (of St. Sabas), struck the point of his javelin against the saint's breast with such violence that all present believed he had been killed. But St. Sabas said: 'Do you think you have slain me? Know that *I felt no more pain than if the javelin had been a lock of wool.*' "[19]

What is one to think of these wondrous facts? To say that they are not credible is to be materialistic. To hold them unhistorical impeaches some of our fathers of Church history. Perhaps the most one could concede is that not all the details of all the cases instanced above are based on first-class historical grounds; this could be granted. But that a large proportion enjoy the guaranty of original sources and contemporary and accredited historians is equally true.

What is done, and daily, by God's mineral or rational creatures can surely be done by His grace.

If by either one can be so deadened as to feel nothing of the surgeon's knife; if by hypnotism another's sensitiveness can be so arrested as to allow of surgical operations, cannot the same Creator of the forces of matter and of mind work similar and even greater effects by His grace? St. Theresa has taught this very theory in her "Relations," where she is explaining visions, trances, raptures and, more particularly, "impetus." She says: "He to whom it ['impetus'] comes, has enough to do in enduring that which is going on within him, *nor do I believe that he would feel if he were grievously tortured;* yet he is in possession of all his senses, can speak and even observe."[20] Under cover, then, of this great mystic one may well hold not only that martyrdom was sometimes painless, but that this occurred by the intervention of the gracious goodness of God, who has so deigned to soothe those who have loved Him perfectly, after His own norm: "No man hath love greater than this: that he should lay down his life for his friend." (John xv., 13.)

---

[16] Socrates' "History of the Church," Bk. III., Ch. XIX.
[17] Butler's "Lives," October 23.
[18] Butler's "Lives," August 21.
[19] Butler's "Lives," April 12.

LOUIS O'DONOVAN.

Baltimore, Md.

THE STRUGGLE FOR RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN GERMANY

IN the opening months of 1879 Bismarck entered upon an entirely new economic policy. He considered that times and circumstances had so altered since the birth of the German Empire that a policy of protection would now be best suited to its internal progress. This change of policy brought about a big discussion in the ranks of his own party. Dr. Falk was one of those who protested most strongly against the change. By his side were ranged the very men of whom Bismarck was most anxious just then to get rid. For the followers of Falk were now reduced to a number of men who were professed atheists or whose Christianity at best consisted in a thorough hatred of the Pope and the Catholic Church. These were, of course, exactly the men who stood in the way of the settlement which the Emperor was so anxious to arrive at. The chance was, therefore, a good one for getting rid of them without resorting to a blunt dismissal, so when Dr. Falk offered his resignation once more, it was accepted by the Emperor, and the bigoted, dogmatic, unpopular author of the May Laws disappeared from the field of politics, in which his efforts had been so unhappy. And with Dr. Falk gone, the greatest obstacle to religious pacification was removed.

But the change in Bismarck's policy was one which brought him into close and friendly contact with the leaders of the Centre. The Catholic Deputies had always supported a policy of protection, and their doing so had often brought them into heated discussions with Bismarck, before the latter had declared himself in favor of it As a result of his change, however, Bismarck saw that, on economic questions at least, the Deputies of the Centre would in the future be his most prominent supporters. A conference was consequently arranged between himself and Windthorst. At this meeting the latter made it quite clear that, outside economic questions, the Centre would reserve absolute liberty to vote for or against the Government as it thought fit. And the promise to support it on economic questions only held good while Bismarck continued to favor his present policy, which had always been the policy of the Centre.

---

[20] "Relat.," VIII., 14.

With even this very conditional promise of support Bismarck seemed content. It must be said to his credit that he very soon gave the Catholics something in return for their support. For the post of Minister of Worship, fallen vacant by the resignation of Dr. Falk, was, on Bismarck's recommendation, given to Herr Puttkamer, a man whose conciliatory disposition towards the Church was well known. He was not a man of lax religious principles, nor was he likely to court the sympathy of the irreligious rabble, as Dr. Falk had done. But his religion was nevertheless most orthodox Protestantism; he had a profound distrust of the Pope, entirely believed in what we in this country know by the name of Papal Aggression, and thought that in every country the State should be the predominant partner in all matters. The clergy in consequence should be on merely the same footing as any of the other officials of the State; they were to receive their salaries, but in return were to do everything that their paymaster, the State, may command.

Still, in spite of his orthodoxy from the Protestant point of view, Herr Puttkamer does not appear to have been a bigot, or Bismarck would not have appointed him to this important post at a moment when he was most anxious for Catholic support to tide him over his political difficulties. Nor would the appointment have been received with such favor by the Catholics, if they did not expect many more concessions from Puttkamer than they had been accustomed to from Dr. Falk.

Chaotic indeed was the condition of religious affairs in Prussia at the time when Dr. Falk disappeared from public life. Out of twelve dioceses, only four had managed to retain their Bishops; among the clergy almost twelve hundred curates and more than six hundred parish priests had either died, been banished or imprisoned and their posts left vacant. In the elementary schools the influence of the Church had been crushed. Religion had not, it is true, been altogether banished, but it had been reduced to a farce. For the religious instruction had been taken out of the hands of the clergy and had been handed over to servants of the State, who were always laymen and sometimes even professed unbelievers in revealed religion. When it was not quite as bad as that, they were orthodox Protestants or perhaps Old Catholics, but never under any circumstances was a loyal Catholic appointed to such a post.

No sooner was Herr Puttkamer firmly established in his new office than petitions began to pour in on him from all sides. In these was set forth an account of the injuries which the Catholics were subjected to during the ministry of Dr. Falk. To all their appeals Herr Puttkamer devoted careful attention. As regards religious education in the schools, what is happening at the present moment in England was happening then in Germany; there was a growing alliance between Catholics and the most religious section of Protestants. They, who otherwise would have been most bitterly opposed, seemed to draw together at the approach of a common foe. Now, of this class of Protestant Herr Puttkamer was a type. He was anti-Roman, it is true, and no doubt he believed a certain amount of the wild stories which are constantly being spread about the Pope and his aspirations. But however badly he may have thought of the headquarters of the Church, he did not shut his eyes to the many virtues of most of its subjects. He recognized that a good Catholic was a man of virtue, and religion, in any shape or form, was more to the new Minister's taste than atheism. As a result, religious instruction was in many cases entrusted once more to the clergy, and the galling restriction that it should be subject to State supervision was, in almost all cases, abolished.

Late in the summer of 1879 negotiations were once more begun between the Government and the Curia. On this occasion Bismarck held a few conferences with Mgr. Jacobini, who was at this time the Papal Nuncio at Vienna. The meetings were of no great importance, nor were they intended to be. The Chancellor and the Nuncio met merely to discuss the lines upon which future and much more important negotiations should be carried on. The two things which were, of course, of the highest importance and likely to cause most discussion were the points which Bismarck had already discussed with Mgr. Aloisi-Masella. The Catholics wanted the May Laws abolished root and branch, that was certain. Bismarck, on the other hand, was haunted with the suspicion—most Protestants are—that full liberty to the Church meant danger to the State. The Catholics would plot, the Pope would plot, the Jesuits would plot, and by such internal dangers the external progress of Germany would be greatly retarded. Consequently, he found it hard to come to terms with the Catholics, who regarded all these fears as nonsense.

The negotiations were resumed at Vienna in the November of this same year. Bismarck himself did not, however, conduct them in person this time, nor did he send Herr Puttkamer. But the State was well represented by Dr. Huebler, an attaché of the Ministry of Worship, while the Catholic claims could not have had a better champion than Mgr. Jacobini. Bismarck's argument, voiced by Dr. Huebler, was this: If the May Laws are not enforced in practice, why are the Catholics so obstinate about having them abolished, even in theory? It does not matter to a Bishop to know that for something which he has done he could have been fined fifty pounds, provided he is not fined. And for this reason Bismarck was strongly disinclined to promise any substantial change in the May Laws and would not listen to any suggestion of their being abolished, but would only promise that the more objectionable of them would not be enforced at all, and the others as clemently as possible.

Mgr. Jacobini was not long about finding an answer to this reasoning. In coming to terms with the State, he pointed out, the Church was bound to take into consideration not merely the present, with its hard, determined facts, but also the future, with its many possibilities. Were there only question of the present, the Church would be quite content with what Bismarck proposed. The Pope was fully convinced that, while Bismarck and Puttkamer remained in office, there was no more to be feared. But what about the future? The present rulers would have to go sooner or later, and who was to guarantee that their places would not be filled by men anxious to injure the Church as much as ever they could? If that possibility were verified, these men would find in the May Laws, if they were allowed to remain on the statute book, justification for all their attacks on the Church. They could truly say that they were only enforcing the law of the land. It was not, therefore, any distrust of Bismarck that dictated to the Catholics the attitude they had taken up, namely, of fighting till the last of the May Laws had been abolished, not only in practice, but in theory as well. Dr. Huebler left Vienna in December with the intention of returning there early in the new year, but Bismarck offered some objections, and negotiations were suspended for a time.

One of the first acts of Herr Puttkamer in the year 1880 was to obtain from the Reichstag discretionary authority in the administration of the May Laws. This was a very important concession, for it really meant that he could practically do away with at least the very objectionable portions of the measures. The power was accorded to him by the Reichstag without very much opposition. Meanwhile diplomatic negotiations were renewed with the Vatican, as the result of some words written by Pope Leo to Mgr. Melchers on February 24. In this letter the Pope said that, for the purpose of hastening the treaty between the Holy See and Prussia, he would be willing that the names of parish priests should be submitted to the Government before they were officially appointed. All the Pope meant by this was, of course, that he would give the civil power an opportunity of pointing out any serious and reasonable objection to the appointment of any particular candidate. It was never intended that the State could oppose an unreasonable refusal to any appointment or that before any such dogmatic *non possumus* the Church would recoil. The Pope only showed himself willing to do in Prussia what he is willing to do everywhere, that is, to ensure that his priests are not merely upholders of the divine law, but of the civil law as well, when the latter is of such a kind that obedience to it does not do violence to the Catholic conscience.

On March 23 Cardinal Nina, in a letter to Mgr. Jacobini, pointed out at greater length how far the Pope was willing to permit the interference of the State in the affairs of the Church. The Pope, he said, could not possibly allow to the State the right to stop any appointment, unless it could show that it was one which was calculated to impede the administration of the civil law, neither could he advise his priests to obey their civil superiors in the carrying out of laws which were manifestly detrimental to religion. Furthermore, the Pope could not cease to protest against the action of the Government in keeping so many Bishops and priests in exile and thus leaving whole districts of Catholics deprived of the consolations of religion.

But these declarations were entirely insufficient for Bismarck. He had expected that a word of conciliation from him would have brought the Roman Curia and the Catholics of Germany to their feet at once. Then, he thought, the whole terms of peace could have been dictated by himself, just as he had dictated his own terms to the Emperor Napoleon III. a few years before. He was in consequence very dissatisfied with the manner in which things had worked out. Even after his conciliatory advances he found the Pope still determined not to advance beyond a certain limit, while, on the other hand, the Catholic Deputies absolutely refused to sell their freedom of action to him. He saw clearly that, instead of dictating, he was having the law laid down for him, and this was a state of things to which, very naturally, he would not give in without a fight.

So once more the Chancellor plunged into a bitter campaign against the Church, which was now guilty of the most unpardonable of crimes—it was winning the day. Berlin, he said, is being fooled; it will not open its eyes to the fact that it is retreating step by step, while the Vatican has not given in on a single point. Against the Catholic Deputies he was particularly bitter. They were, he said, ready to ally themselves with any one, Socialist or atheist, who promised to fight the Government. They were supported in this nefarious work by the Bishops and priests; they sought recruits everywhere, among the rich and poor alike. "Nor can it be said," he wrote at this time, "that these men have been led into error by a few agitators, in view of the fact that ecclesiastics of all ranks support them and that a powerful nobility is on their side. It must be attributed to the influence of confessors on the men, and still more on the women. A single word from the Pope or from the Bishops would bring to an end this unnatural alliance between nobility and Socialism."

In spite, however, of the Chancellor, the cause of peace went ahead. The Pope wanted it, the Emperor wanted it, Germany wanted it; in fact, the world wanted it. The Bishops began to come back and the vacant parishes were being steadily filled up. The May Laws, though still in existence, were being ignored on all sorts of pretexts, and their infringement was now followed by no penalty. In the teeth of all these forces Bismarck could not hold out. He was unconverted, unconvinced, but he was conquered. Great, therefore, was the jubilation all over Catholic Germany when it became known that Bismarck had expressed his determination to reëstablish the Prussian embassy to the Vatican and mantain an accredited representative at the court of the Pope. This he did during the course of the year 1882. Whatever may have been Bismarck's ulterior motive for this action—and many historians have attributed to him the most sinister of motives—does not matter much now. Be that as it may, the Catholics at the time saw in it the certainty that the diplomatic negotiations between Rome and Berlin were not merely to be continued, but were to be carried out on more ordinary lines. Hitherto they had been sporadic and fitful, being carried on sometimes with the Nuncio at Munich, sometimes with Mgr. Jacobini at Vienna, but never with a man specially deputed for that purpose only. Just a little before this time, Mgr. Jacobini, whose conduct during the preliminary negotiations had won for him the entire confidence of the Catholics, as well as the good will of the Government, had been promoted to the important post of Secretary of State to the Pope, and was therefore the man who, after the Pope, would have most to do with the carrying on of future arrangements.

The discretionary powers which had been granted to Herr Puttkamer in July, 1880, came to an end in January, 1882, but they were, without any difficulty, renewed in the March of the same year. The new law passed on this occasion gave the Minister of

Worship power to allow the exiled Bishops to return and to dispense the young priests from all examinations conducted by the State. Two Bishops alone were exempted from this concession, Mgr. Melchers, Archbishop of Cologne, and Mgr. Ledochowski, Archbishop of Posen. Mgr. Melchers was objectionable, because his loyalty to the Pope was more conspicuous, or perhaps more demonstrative, than that of any of the other Bishops. What the objection to Mgr. Ledochowski was is not certain. He was Polish by birth, but very little in sympathy with the national aspirations of the Poles, and one would have thought that for this reason he should rather have been a *persona grata* in Germany. But whatever the reason, the fact remains that he was still forbidden to return to Germany when an amnesty had been granted to his colleagues. In the November of this same year the Emperor made practically his first public reference to the great conflict which had been going on for so many years in his empire. In his speech from the throne he expressed his deep gratification that diplomatic relations had once more been established between his Government and the Holy See. A short time after, in an autograph letter to Pope Leo, he declared himself anxious to push forward the arrangements which would lead to a filling up of the vacant parishes.

On July 18, 1883, the Prince Imperial Frederick, then on a visit to Rome, made a state journey to the Vatican to pay his respects to Pope Leo XIII. The audience lasted an hour and a half, but what subjects were discussed during it were not known, as no details were supplied to the outside world. It was rumored, however, that the conversation was not about the religious crisis in Germany, but that, nevertheless, the Prince had declared that his efforts would be given unsparingly to the bringing about and maintaining of religious peace in the Fatherland.

Practically the only factor that now held out against peace was Bismarck. It was not exactly that he did not want the struggle ended, but he did not consider that it was being ended in the right way. He seemed to think that the Government should have got all sorts of concessions for repealing the May Laws, just as, almost a century ago, some members of the English Cabinet thought that the Catholic Church in these countries should have become a sort of State foundling in return for the repeal of the penal code. He furthermore objected to having the initiative in any measure of repeal taken by the Catholic Deputies, and whenever that did happen the measure was invariably defeated. When a Conservative administration came into power in 1884, several of its most prominent members were open advocates of the total abolition of the May Laws. Bismarck was pressed for a declaration of his policy, and stated that he was ready to proceed to a substantial revision of the legislation as soon as he was sure that Rome meant something practical and not merely theoretical in granting the civil power a veto over ecclesiastical appointments. He softened fair-minded Protestants by assuring them that after a while, under the influence of mild administration, Catholics would grow sick of the struggle to wipe out laws which were not, as a matter of fact, enforced.

It is generally the rôle of extraordinary men to do extraordinary things, and Bismarck was no exception to the general rule. And just at this period, by one of those extraordinary acts, he saved Germany from a very unpleasant situation. The Germans had long been dissatisfied with the treatment meted out to their fellow-countrymen in the Caroline Islands. They held that they were denied the ordinary commercial concessions granted to other nations. As the easiest method of remedying their grievance, Germany, in 1885, calmly proceeded to take possession of the islands and expel the Spaniards. Spanish pride was at once aroused, and wild meetings were held at Madrid to demand the declaration of war against Germany. And war was actually on the point of being declared when, to the utter astonishment of the whole world, the Cabinet of Berlin, on the motion of Bismarck himself, proposed that the whole matter should be submitted to the arbitration of Pope Leo XIII. Spain, needless to say, immediately agreed, knowing that, as far as the rightful ownership of the islands was concerned, there was really only one side to the question.

Pope Leo did not see how he could accept the position of judge in a matter about which his opinion had already been formed. He agreed, however, to act as mediator and to propose terms which, rendering justice to both parties, would avert the drastic and unsatisfactory remedy of warfare. This part he carried out with signal success, and an agreement was drawn up which, while recognizing the right of Spain to the possession of the islands, gave to German subjects protection and the commercial advantages to which they were justly entitled. This agreement was signed in the Vatican on December 13, 1885, by the representatives of Spain and Germany, and the whole trouble came to an end. The satisfactory settlement of this very contentious question must have been forgotten by those who deliberately and maliciously managed to have the Pope refused a representation in the International Peace Conference held at The Hague. The Cabinets of Europe can claim to have spent much money, built a magnificent conference hall and made many speeches on peace, but the whole of them together cannot claim to have accomplished as much practical pacification as did Pope Leo, without money or speeches, in the dispute of 1885.

As a token of esteem for what he had done in the interests of peace the Emperor William sent a magnificent pectoral cross to the Pope and letters of a most cordial nature were exchanged between them. Letters were also exchanged between the Pontiff and Bismarck, who was created by Pope Leo Chevalier of the Order of Christ. It is said by many that the ultimate object of the Chancellor in inviting the mediation of the Pope was to induce the latter to bring the religious struggle to an end by not insisting on a formal repeal of the May Laws. If such was really his intention, he was doomed to disappointment, for Pope Leo, in his letter to him, hinted very plainly that the friendly relations established between them by the incident of the Caroline Islands should conduce to rather than lead away from that end.

"Your political genius," wrote the Pontiff, "has, as the whole world knows, contributed much to the creation of the great and powerful Empire of Germany, and it is natural that the solidity and prosperity of that Empire should be the chief object of your concern. But it cannot have escaped your foresight that much can also be done in the cause of law and order by the power with which we are invested, more especially if that power enjoys without hindrance its full freedom of action. We may, therefore, be excused for looking forward in spirit and for regarding that which has already been done as a prelude of still greater things to be done in the future."

The determination of the Pope to maintain an attitude of unshaken resistance to any attempt at interfering with the unquestionable rights of the Church was made still more clear in a letter which he addressed to the Bishops of Prussia in January, 1886. Having praised the loyalty of the hierarchy during the whole crisis and once more expressed the hope that peace was now close at hand the Pontiff continues: "But though we are animated by a sincere desire to bring about peace, nevertheless it is impossible for us to interfere in any way with the established law of God, and to defend this we, after the example of our predecessors, shall not hesitate to proceed to the utmost limits."

It was a very happy omen for the Catholics that just at this moment the Emperor called to a seat in the upper Prussian Chamber —corresponding to the English House of Lords—Mgr. Kopp, at that time Bishop of Fulda, now the Cardinal Archbishop of Breslau. At the same time the Government took its first step backwards and began the drawing up of a series of laws which would have the effect of directly abrogating the May Laws.

Long and arduous were the debates to which these changes in the legislation gave rise. On one point Bismarck showed himself thoroughly consistent; he would listen to no advice from the Catholic Deputies. He would have preferred to begin the whole struggle over again rather than have it said that his hands were forced by any section of the assembly of which he regarded himself the dictator. This treatment was in no way resented by the Catholic members; provided peace was made, they were indifferent as to who made it, and they knew, moreover, that even if Bismarck had sought their advice, the last word would have to be pronounced by the Holy See.

The only one concession in this way which the Chancellor made to the Catholics was to appoint Mgr. Kopp one of the commission charged with the formulation of new laws. He felt it absolutely necessary that some Catholic should have a part in the negotiations, to keep them in touch with the Pope, and he chose Mgr. Kopp from the fact that he owed his position to the nomination of a Protestant Emperor and not to the votes of Catholic electors. After a while the main provisions of the new legislation began to be widely known and discussed. One article suppressed what was known as the State examination for the clergy and authorized the reopening of the old ecclesiastical colleges. These colleges were, moreover, to be practically freed from the police supervision to which thy had formerly been subject. Another decree conceded to the Church the right to judge all matters of ecclesiastical discipline, but granted the right of appeal to any priests who may have been deprived of their stipends. Further provisions rendered it no longer illegal to say Mass in public or to administer the sacraments without any authorization from the State. Then, in conclusion, the decrees against the religious orders were relaxed and freedom was given to all, with the single exception of the Jesuits. On the other hand, however, the State clung tenaciously to its old theory that all ecclesiastical appointments should first be notified to the State, and should receive the sanction of the civil power before being put into force.

With regard to this latter point, there were serious differences of opinion among the Catholics. Many were inclined to think that it should not be granted. The Government, they said, will be compelled to come to terms with us sooner or later, and it is foolish to pay a heavy price now for what we will get for nothing in a few months' time. They held, moreover, that this partial veto would subject ecclesiastical appointments to all sorts of official wire-pulling, so that finally it would mean that the less principle a man had the more sure of promotion would he be. Others, on the contrary, were entirely in favor of granting it. These took more into consideration the fact that hundreds of parishes were without a priest, that thousands of Catholics all over the empire were dying without the consolations of religion and were being buried like pagans, and they were willing to pay almost any price to have this state of things ended.

Between these two extreme opinions the Holy See, mindful of its high responsibility, steered a middle course. It could not shut its eyes to the large amount of truth which there was in both arguments. While the present state of things was undoubtedly deplorable, yet it was not at all impossible that too high a price might be paid for its alleviation. A cunning politician might easily work his plans so well that what seemed to be a charter of emancipation for the Church might in reality prove to be a means of placing it in still greater subjection. But Pope Leo XIII. was not the man to be easily duped. Through the medium of Cardinal Kopp he proposed three amendments which, if they were accepted, would settle the matter as far as the Church was concerned. In these it was stipulated that the Church could not bind itself to promote only those ecclesiastics who should be actively supported by the State. The Pope, however, was willing to promise that no one should be promoted to any influential position against whom the State was able to prove disloyalty to the established régime. And for this reason and in this sense he was willing to submit the names of ecclesiastics to the State before they were promoted to any position of importance. But he insisted that before this would be done the Government should undertake a complete revision of the May Laws and remove from the statute book any law which a priest could not coonscientiously obey. The reason for this demand was quite evident. In undertaking to promote no priest but one who would promise loyal obedience to the laws of the State the Pope was bound to see that none of these laws was contrary to the doctrine or discipline of the Catholic Church. Had he not done this, he would have placed his priests in an impossible position; he would be commanding them to obey and resist the State at the same time.

To these conditions the Government at length agreed, and the new measure passed safely through the upper house and became law in May, 1886. In April the Pope had authorized the Bishops to make the necessary notification to the Government before making any appointments. The horizon looked very bright, and all that was now awaited was the final revision of the May Laws, when an incident arose which threatened to throw the Catholics back once more into the wilderness of strife and persecution.

The relations between Germany and France had been of the very worst kind since the war of 1870. Yet no one regarded a renewal of hostilities between them as very probable. But in the middle of the eighties the bad feeling became still more accentuated. There was in France at that time a man who seemed then to be about to make history. This was General Boulanger, a fiery demagogue, without much ability, without much courage, but of tremendous influence with the rabble all over France. During the year 1886, when he was at the zenith of his power, some trouble arose between Germany and France over the arrest of a spy. The menacing tone which Booulanger adopted and the manner in which he denounced the Germans threw all Germany into a ferment and both countries in alarm began to prepare for war.

The scare produced by this event put the religious question into the background for a moment. At the opening of the Parliamentary session of 1887 Bismarck pointed out the grave danger to which Germany was exposed, a danger which would be the more augmented the more Boulanger's power increased. To guard against this crisis the Chancellor introduced a bill for raising considerably the standing army and making the term of compulsory military service seven years instead of three. The Socialists raised an immediate outcry against the measure. The decision of the Catholic party was awaited with the greatest interest, and a howl of rage went up from the Government when Windthorst declared that his followers were determined to resist the measure. This decided its fate, and when a vote was taken on January 4, Bismarck's bill was defeated by a majority of 26.

The defeat of the Government created a sensation throughout the whole of Germany. The Chancellor denounced his opponents in the strongest language and was especially hard on the Catholics. He branded Windthorst as an enemy of the State and declared publicly that the action of the Catholics was directly in opposition to the wishes of the Pope. Nevertheless, the Catholics showed no signs of yielding, and, no other course being possible, the Parliament was dissolved on January 14.

In the meantime great disorder was spread throughout the Catholic ranks. Bismarck's remark, it soon became evident, was not mere wild speculation, but had something behind it. And what that something was quickly came to light. While the general election was pending, some letters, of their very nature confidential and private, were published in one of the Government journals. How they came into the possession of this journal is not known, but there certainly must have been great indiscretion on the part of one or more of the leading Catholics. The first document was a letter from Cardinal Jacobini to the Papal Nuncio at Munich. In this letter the Cardinal exhorted the Nuncio to use his influence with the Catholic Deputies that they might vote for Bismarck's measure.

This, he said, was the wish of the Holy Father, who hoped that, if the Catholics adopted this attitude, the concessions obtained from the Government in the revision of the May Laws would be still greater. Furthermore, the proposed change seemed to be founded on very just grounds. France was undoubtedly in a ferment, and there was no knowing when she may rush into war with Germany. "If by accepting this measure," the Cardinal concluded, "the peril of war can be avoided, the Centre, by supporting it, will have merited well of the country, of Europe and of humanity."

The text of this letter was very probably not known to the Catholic Deputies before the vote on Bismarck's measure was taken. But for the appearance of the letter in a public paper there would have been no more about it. Its public appearance, however, changed matters entirely. Protestants made mountains out of what they termed the disloyalty of Catholics. Many Catholics were enraged because they thought that their representatives had really snubbed some advice received from the Vatican. So great was the storm raised that one of the leading members of the Catholic party—the Baron de Frankenstein—wrote to the Nuncio at Munich, calling for a definite decision as to how far they were bound to obey the injunctions they had received.

"I need scarcely repeat," he wrote, "that the Centre was always prepared to carry out the orders of the Holy See when there was question of ecclesiastical laws. But as far back as 1880 I had stated that the Centre could not undertake to promise obedience with regard to laws not connected with religious affairs. In my opinion it would be a calamity for the Centre and a source of serious trouble for the Holy See if the Centre was to seek instructions in measures which are entirely unconnected with the rights of our Holy Church." The letter added that, if the Pope laid it incumbent on them to vote for this measure, they were prepared to resign their places to other candidates who felt themselves able to comply with the order. In times of struggle, when men's passions are roused to a high pitch, there is a tendency to pick quarrels without any great reason. Men do not stop to think or to reason; they are too much inclined to regard themselves as bullied when in reality they are merely cautioned by some one who is not aroused to such a pitch as themselves. Sensible Catholics know quite well that, in a question of politics, the Holy See would never attempt to dictate. Even the greatest Catholic layman that the modern world has known—Daniel O'Connell—declared on one occasion that he would as soon take his politics from Constantinople as from Rome. For the great Irish Liberator knew quite well that the Pope had about as much intention of dictating to him in questions of politics as had the Sultan of

Turkey. But neither O'Connell nor any other Catholic leader did or ever would refuse to weigh deeply any words of advice that came to him from the lips of the Roman Pontiff. They may not act upon them, but they certainly would not despise them as valueless. And neither did the German Catholics when they came to understand the Pope's action in the present case.

To the Baron de Frankenstein's letter a reply was immediately returned by Cardinal Jacobini. He first disposed of the suggestion that the present Catholic Deputies should resign and paid a high tribute to the excellent work which they had done in defense of their religious liberties. With regard to the advice which the Holy See had seen fit to tender them, the Cardinal explained that the one object the Pope had in view was to prevent the giving of any excuse to the Government for refusing to carry out the promised revision of the May Laws. The action of the Centre party in opposing the Government might be seized upon by an unscrupulous opponent to raise a popular agitation, which would have the effect of delaying indefinitely the peace which now looked so near. And hence the Pope was in reality only anxious to point out that a question of politics might have a direct and disastrous bearing upon a religious question of the highest importance.

The explanation of the Cardinal and the gravity of the reasons which he alleged for the Pope's action made a deep impression on the minds of the Catholics. The more prudent among them began to see that they had been rather hasty in construing the words of the Pontiff unfavorably and in taking up an attitude of opposition to him. A great Catholic meeting was in consequence convened at Cologne, at which Windthorst presided. The old Catholic leader did not fail to touch in the happiest of manners on the recent friction.

"The letter of Cardinal Jacobini," he said, "sets forth the desires of our most beloved Holy Father, Leo XIII. We most gladly welcome, with the greatest joy for the future and, above all, for the present anything that comes to us from our Holy Father. We would be heartless children if we did not experience a lively pleasure at knowing the wishes of our father. Our opponents pretend to believe that in these wishes there is something which we do not like, and on every side we hear it proclaimed that our action has been condemned by the Pope. But if any one should rejoice, it is we ourselves. In the letter of Cardinal Jacobini the Pope acknowledges that the Centre deserves well of the Church for having skilfully defended its sacred rights. The Holy Father gives it as his opinion that the Centre should continue to exist. What more could we ask for? Could we, in our electoral manifesto, say to you anything better than this: It is the Holy Father himself who sends us to Parliament?"

He then proceeded to dispel the idea that the Catholic Deputies were in revolt against the Holy See. Cardinal Jacobini's letter was written on January 3, so that it could not have reached Munich until January 5, or very late on January 4, the day on which Bismarck's bill was defeated. The Catholics, therefore, were entirely unaware of the wishes of the Pope when they voted. But now that they did know them, there was not the slightest intention of despising them.

"I promise that, after the opening of the new Parliament," declared Windthorst, "the members of the Centre party will give the most serious attention to the letter of Cardinal Jacobini, and will do all they can in the direction pointed out in that letter."

Immediately after the reopening of Parliament the bill for the additional military service was again introduced and this time passed. The Catholic members, with seven exceptions, abstained from voting, and thus gave the Government a majority. The Government then proceeded to the promised revision of the May Laws. As before, the chief point of contention was the accurate defining of the limits of the veto possessed by the State over ecclesiastical appointments. This was treated of in the second article of the new code, in which it was laid down that the State would only look into the civil virtues of any candidate and leave to the Church the right to judge him from the point of view of orthodoxy. But one very important side of the question was left untouched. That was as to what proof should be judged sufficient to have a man vetoed, and, in the event of a difference of opinion between the two parties, how matters were to be arranged.

To many Catholics it seemed that such a measure would, to a certain extent, leave the Church at the mercy of the State. If the Church, they argued, agrees to this, it will have bound itself to recede before an arbitrary *non possumus* of Protestant and prejudiced officials. So serious did the situation appear that the majority of the Catholic journals did not hesitate to declare that it was the duty of the Centre to vote against it. Even Mgr. Kopp declared that, though he would vote for the measure, he hoped to see it considerably amended, and intimated that this was the opinion of the other Bishops as well as of the Catholic people of Germany. It finally required the voice of the Pope himself to direct and unite the Catholics. In a letter to the Archbishop of Cologne Pope Leo expressed his mind on the subject. That he regarded the question as rather complicated is evident from the fact that he says that, before writing, he had consulted several of the Cardinals on the point. As a result of these careful deliberations, he declares that the contemplated measure is a remedy for many evils which have caused friction, that it is by no means useless and should not be rejected, since it opens up the way to the peace which has been so long looked for. He therefore exhorted the Catholics to trust to the vigilance of the Holy See for future events, and vote for this measure when it was put before them.

It was during the course of the debate on this measure that Bismarck gave expression to perhaps the most remarkable tribute that has ever been paid to the Papacy by a Protestant politician, speaking before an audience predominantly Protestant. He had been severely censured by some of the Deputies for permitting what they regarded as the interference of the Pope in the internal affairs of the empire, and they ventured to prophesy that, though it had been to his advantage in the military service bill, he would yet deeply regret having tolerated such a precedent. "As to the action of the Pope with regard to our internal affairs," he said in reply, "I doubt very much if we can regard the Pope as an outsider. In my capacity as representative of the Government, I affirm that the Papacy is not merely an outside and universal institution, but also a German institution for our Catholic fellow-citizens. I would indeed injure the country's best interests if, through national vanity, I rejected the help of so conscientious and powerful a ruler as the Pope, for no other reason than that he resides in Rome."

The Chancellor then earnestly begged the members to accept the measure, threatening, if it should be rejected, to resign his position.

"My political honor," he said, "is pledged to this measure. We are at the present time exposed to grave peril from internal and external revolutionary parties, and I consequently regard it as essential that all domestic feuds should be healed before these dangers come about."

The advice of Pope Leo XIII. had, of course, already settled the matter for the Catholic Deputies, who voted unanimously for the measure. No serious opposition was offered to it, and as early as April 28 it received the signature of the Emperor and became law.

It would be vain to pretend that even this further measure of relief restored to the Catholics their full rights or placed them on terms of equality with their Protestant fellow-countrymen. There is no one who has not heard of the great Act of Emancipation by which the Catholics of the British Isles were liberated from the penal laws which had enslaved them for centuries. Yet even after the passing of that act it took measure after measure to complete the emancipation, if it can be said to be complete even now. It would no doubt come as a surprise to many to hear that, although nearly a hundred years have elapsed since the Catholics of Ireland are supposed to have been emancipated, no Catholic is allowed to hold the post of Lord Lieutenant in that country. His Majesty's first lieutenant in Catholic Ireland may be a Jew, he may be an atheist, he may be even a pagan—but he must not be a Catholic.

Difficulties and inequalities of the same kind still existed in Germany after the revision of the May Laws in 1887. But, nevertheless, the measure was a distinct relief, and, as such, to reject it would have been absurd. As it stood, much, of course, depended upon whether it was worked in a friendly or in a hostile spirit. But Pope Leo knew quite well that the Government, as well as the Curia, wanted peace and not war, and he consequently regarded it as certain that its present imperfect state would, bit by bit, be improved. The most important concession granted in the new bill was the full and entire recognition of the Papal authority over the clergy in all matters of discipline. Its weakest point, from the Catholic point of view, was the very limited power it conceded to the ecclesiastical authorities in the matter of education.

In spite of many defects, the new bill was undoubtedly a great come-down for the man who had set himself, as so many others have done, to the task of putting the Catholic masses at variance with the Pope and to establish that absurd contradiction—a National Catholic Church. If the whole of Pope Leo's pontificate had been confined to that one struggle, he would still deserve a niche in the Temple of Fame for having wrung such a concession from the most able and the most powerful of modern statesmen, at the head of the mightiest and perhaps the most Protestant State in the world. Not even his bitterest opponents made any attempt to deny that the victory was almost entirely due to the skill and the firmness of Pope Leo XIII. M. Geffcken, a man who will certainly not be accused of any great partiality for the Papacy or the Catholic cause, gave his opinion of the Chancellor's come-down, soon after the passing of the new law.

"The great Chancellor," he wrote, "has never understood the nature of the conflict into which he blindly rushed. Rome and the Centre accepted every concession as a stepping-stone to something more; but they on their side conceded nothing. At last the Chancellor, who, as recently as 1880, in a dispatch to the Prince de Reuss, the Ambassador at Vienna, had declared that the revision of the May Laws was an absurd idea which had never received the least encouragement, was obliged to beg the upper chamber to assist him in casting off the last shackles of the May Laws. Behold what a pass the Man of Iron has come to!

"Facts have proved that the distinction between fighting Popes and conciliatory ones is likewise meaningless. It is simply a question of tactics. The anathemas of Pius IX. against this modern Attila only had the effect of rousing him still more. The calmness of Leo XIII., as obliging in questions of method as he was firm in those of principle, his determination and his patience, have been too much for even this doughty adversary. So much so that recently Prince Bismarck, to cloak his defeat, has been pretending that he himself had never desired anything but a harmonious adjustment of the relations between Church and State, but that 'other hands' had frustrated his great design."

Every one knows how unstable is the equilibrium of a country, in which a civil war has raged, for many years after peace has been proclaimed. As far as can be judged by an outsider, America has not yet fully recovered from the evil effects of the terrible civil war which desolated her plains more than fifty years ago. And the very same is true of Germany. From 1887 onwards there have been several occasions on which it seemed certain that the smouldering embers of the Kulturkamp would burst into flame once more. But they never have done so, nor, we think, are they very likely to in the present squabble over the Jesuits. Two individuals, generally speaking, become friends when they abandon their quarrel; but this is not at all the case in disputes between two nations or between two masses of the same nation. Externally they may maintain a friendly attitude, but it takes very little to set them at each other's throat once again. And consequently, for some time after the peace of 1887 there existed in Germany an atmosphere of suspicion between the two parties who had so recently been at war. One of the greatest guarantees of peace, however, was the disposition of the old Emperor William. Every one knew that the empire would not engage in any prolonged conflict to which the head of the State was opposed, and there was no doubt that the Emperor was determined to crush any attempt at reviving the Kulturkampf. Nor were any fears entertained by the Catholics as to the views of Prince Frederick, who was to succeed him. To a man of his cultured mind and refined tastes the idea of conflict was abhorrent, while his well-known adherence to Liberal principles was sufficient guarantee that he would not persecute in the name of religion. Beyond him the people did not look. They little thought that within the space of a few months the destinies of Germany were to be guided by a man to whose disposition or character no one devoted a thought at the time.

WILLIAM J. HEGARTY.

Exeter, England.

CHRONOLOGY OF OUR LORD'S LIFE.

THE chronology of Our Lord's life is a very difficult subject. At first sight it would seem impossible to develop this question, seeing the great difference of opinion there is as to the age of Jesus when He died. Some authorities fix His age as thirty, others as thirty-three, while some say that He was forty, and still others even fifty years old. "Sententias vero has non argumentis, nec verbis S. Scripturae (Stephanus) confirmavit: sed testimonius tantum, ut scriptor putavit, variorum patrum . . . Dominus noster Jesus Christus tricesimo aetatis anno crucifixus est, et non tricesimo, sed tricesimo tertio. Et non tricesimo tertio, sed quadragesimo; et nec trigesimo tertio nec etiam solum quadragesimo, sed amplius, non multum a quinquagesimo distans."[1]

This modest work gives first a short review of the different opinions of the fathers on the subject; then it establishes the true historical and traditional chronology of Christ, confirming it with prophecies, and shows the original occasion of erroneous chronologies.

The widespread and practically unanimous opinion of Catholic writers for many centuries (beginning with Dionysius Exiguus in the earlier part of the sixth century) agreed in assigning the birth of Jesus to the second year of the lunar cycle, in December, A. D. 1: "Tenet ergo vulgus Latinorum quod Dominus fuit natus secundo anno cycli decemnovennalis;"[2] His baptism to January, A. D. 31, and His death to March, A. D. 34: "Denique anno ab ejus incarnatione juxta Dionysium septingentesimo primo, indictione quartadecima fratres nostri qui tunc fuere Romae, hoc modo se in natali Domini in cereis sanctae Mariae scriptum vidisse, et inde descripsisse referebant. A passione Domini nostri Jesu Christi anni sunt 668. 532 annis circulus paschalis circumagitur, his adde 33 vel potius 34, ut illum ipsum quo passus est Dominus attingere possis annum, fiunt 566. Ipse est ergo annus dominicae passionis. Sancta siquidem Romana et apostolica Ecclesia . . . tempus dominicae passionis in memoriam populis revocans, numerum annorum triginta semper et tribus annis minorem quam ab ejus incarnatione Dionysius ponat, adnotat."[3]

In the fourth century Eusebius, however, having fixed the year of the birth of Christ as the 42d year of Augustus A. U. C. 751 (i. e., B. C. 2): "Annus agebatur XLII. regni Augusti . . . et ab Antonii Cleopatraeque morte annus XXVIII.,[4] attributed the baptism of Our Lord to the ending of what was called A. C. 30, the 15th of Tiberius, A. U. C. 780; (i. e., A. D. 27) and the death of Christ to A. C. 34, the 19th of Tiberius, A. U. C. 784 (i. e., A. D. 31). The duration of the ministry of Jesus, extending over three years, was suggested to Eusebius by an historical argument: "Cum ergo ab Annae ponticacatu exorsus ad Caipha pontificatum docere perstiterit, vix hoc temporis intervallo quadriennium integrum continetur."[5]

---

[1] Photii Biblioteca, Stephani Cobari Tritheitae liber.

[2] Bacon R. Opus Majus IV., 4, 15.

[3] Beda Ven. De Tem. ratione c. 47.

Afterwards S. Jerome ascribed the birth of Jesus to the 42d year of Augustus (i. e., B. C. 2). He dated the baptism as occurring in January, A. C. 31, the 16th of Tiberius; (i. e., A. D. 29), and His death in A. C. 33, the 18th of Tiberius; (i. e., A. D. 31): "Scriptum est in Evangelio secundum Joannem, per tria pascha Dominum venisse in Jerusalem, quae duos annos efficiunt (In Joann II., xiii)."[6] "Jerome, no doubt, because he allotted to the ministry only two to three years, and not like Eusebius, three to four, substitutes Tiberius 18."[7] The opinion of St. Jerome corresponds to that of the following fathers: "Tiberius Cæsar regnavit annis 22. Decimo vero octavo anno regni ipsius, expleto redemptionis opere, Salvator crucifixus surrexit a mortuis."[8] "Juxta Joannem Evangelistam (II., VI.) per tria paschata duos postea implevit annos."[9] "Trium annorum spatio miraculis celebratus est;"[10] "Post haec erat festus Judaeorum. Quod festum? Pentecostes ut mihi videtur."[11] "Per totum enim biennium. . . . evangelican praedicationem tradidit."[12] "Omnino tria (Paschata) sint toto illi praedicationis tempori tribuenda."[13] "Mense X. ad Joannem accessit . . . anno a nativitate sua XXX. . . . annos habens absolutos XXX. . . . Anno ab Incarnatione sua XXXIII. . . . passionem . . . subiit."[14]

Origen, Ps. Tertullian and St. Augustine assigned the birth of Christ to about A. U. C. 752, His baptism to A. U. C. 781, His death to A. U. C. 782, coincident with A. D. 29: "Statuerunt illi triginta stateres quantos annos Salvator peregrinatus fuerat;"[15] "Anno enim et Aliquot mensibus docuit."[16] "Quae passio perfecta

---

[4] Hist. Eccl. I., V.

[5] Eusebius, Hist. I., X., 2.

[6] Hieron. comm. in Isaiam 1, IX., cap. XXIX.

[7] Hastings, A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospel Art. Chronology.

[8] Basilius Seleuciensis Oratio XXXVIII., 5.

[9] Apollinaris Laudiceus in Hieronymo comm. in Dan. IX.

[10] Chrysostomus Hom. XXI., 2.

[11] Chrysostomus Hom. XXXVI., in Joann. V., 1.

[12] Cyrillus comm. in Isaiam, I., III., 29, v., 1., 4.

[13] Epiphanius Adv. Haer. I., II., 51, 22.

[14] Epiphanius ibi 51, 25.

[15] Origenes Tract. 35 in Matt. 5.

[16] Origenes peri archon IV., 16.

est sub Tiberio Cæsare Coss. Rubellio Gemino et Rufio Gemino . . . . annos habens quasi triginta quando pateretur."[17] "A Nativitate Domini hodie computantur ferme anni 420; a Resurrectione 390:"[18] "Mortuus est duobus Geminis Coss."[19]

According to Ps. Cyprian and Hilarianus, Jesus died after completing thirty-one years, in the sixteenth year of Tiberius; "Passus V. id. April . . . passus est luna XV. . . . Anni XXX. quibus expletis Dominus Jesus a nativitate sua baptizatus est a Joanne anno XV. Tiberii Cæsaris: cujus anno XVI. passus est et resurrexit."[20] "Uno proinde anno Judaicae genti . . . praedicavit . . . usque in annum XVI. Tiberii Cæsaris . . . eo anno passus est . . . luna XIV., VIII. Kal. Apr."[21] According to Orosius, Jesus died in the year of Tiberius XVII.; "Anno U. C. 752 . . . Augusti emenso propemodum anno 42 natus est Christus . . . deinde anno XVII. ejusdem Tiberii . . . se tradidit passioni."[22]

The Valentinians referred the birth of Jesus to the 28th year of Augustus and A. U. C. 759, and His baptism as well as His death to the 15th year of Tiberius and A. U. C. 788; "Duodecimo autem mense eum passum, ut sit anno uno post baptismum praedicans."[23] "Colliguntur autem omnes anni a Romulo qui Romani condidit usque ad mortem Commodi anni 953 menses sex. Natus autem est Dominus noster XXVIII. anno cum primum jusserunt censum Descriptioneme fieri tempore Augusti . . . et quod anno solo oporteret eum praedicare. . . . Quintodecimo ergo anno Tiberii et quintodecimo Augusti sic implentur triginta anni usque ad tempus quo passus est . . . fiunt autem ex quo natus est Dominus usque ad mortem Commodi anni omnes 194, mensis unus, dies tredecim;"[24] i. e., A. U. C. 953 less 194 years=A. U. C. 759, A. D. 6, the year of the second census of Cyrenius in Judaea, which was presumed to be the one mentioned in Luke ii., 1-21. They agreed on the year of Rome 759, the 28th year of Augustus, etc., relying upon Luke iii., 1-23.

Some writers (quidam) attributed the first year of Julius Cæsar to (A. U. C. 953 less years 236)=A. U. C. 717; the first year of Augustus to A. U. C. 720; the 32d year of Augustus and the birth of Christ to A. U. C. 752; the 16th of Tiberius and the death of Christ to A. U. C. 782; "Julius Cæsar annis 3, quator mensibus,

---

[17] Ps. Tertull. Adv. Jud. VIII.

[18] S. Augustinus Epistola 80 ad Hesychium.

[19] S. Augustinus De Civitate Dei XVIII. caput ultimum.

[20] Ps. Cyprian Computus Paschae.

[21] Q. J. Hilarianus De die paschae et mensi XV.

[22] Orosius I., I.; VI., 22; VIII., 2, 3.

[23] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. II., 22.

[24] Clem. Alex. Strom. I., 21, p. 147.

quinque diebus. Post quem regnavit Augustus annis 46 mensibus quatour die uno. A Julio ergo Cæsare usque ad mortem Commodi anni sunt 236, menses sex. Colliguntur autem omnes anni a Romulo qui Roman condidit usque ad mortem Commodi, anni 953, menses sex."[25]

So the different views of the Chronology of Jesus were many. First, the Valentinians held that the ministry of Jesus covered a period of twelve months, or something less; second, Origen Ps. Tertullian, and some others, following the Gospel of St. John, admit a ministry of one year and three or four months; Origen in one place speaks of a ministry of three years, after the Jewish fashion; the first year from January to Nisan A. D. 28; the second year from Nisan A. D. 28 to Nisan (exclusive) A. D. 29; the third year Nisan A. D. 29; third, St. Jerome, St. Epiphanius and others, because of St. John's Gospel, extended the ministry to two years and three months; fourth, Beda to three years and three months. The age of Jesus changed according to the duration of the ministry. The date of His death was variously placed at the 15th, the 16th, the 17th, the 18th and the 19th year of Tiberius.

DATE OF THE NATIVITY OF JESUS.

The opinions placing the birth of Jesus in the 28th or 41st year of Augustus (A. U. C. 751) or even in the 42d or 43d of Augustus must be excluded—*a priori*—for Jesus was born at the time of King Herod (Matt. ii., 1) and consequently before the year A. U. C. 750.

Eusebius (Chronicon) refers the first Apology of St. Justin to A. U. C. 142; U. C. 893, that is, to A. D. 139; since St. Justin there counts 150 years of Christ, he would refer the birth of Our Lord to about B. C. 11, which would make Jesus forty years of age.

But Eusebius fixed—*a priori*—the Chronology of Christ, and then we well know how unfaithful he is about those events which have relation to the said Chronology of Our Lord. Also the internal evidence of the dedication of the first Apology is not very trustworthy in its present condition: "The text is probably corrupt."[26]

St. Epiphanius remains the best authority: "Justinus . . . pro Christo martyrio perfunctus . . . sub Rustico praefecto,Adriano imperante." If St. Epiphanius is right, the Apology of St. Justin must be referred to about A. D. 130 and his account of the birth of Christ to about B. C. 20.

In every case the authority of St. Justin is in favor of an earlier date for the birth of Jesus. Apart from this statement of St. Justin, antiquity only professed the birth of Jesus at the time of Augustus, indefinitely. Tertullian, writing about 206 A. D., speaks of the birth of Christ as having occurred less than 250 years before. He was evidently reckoning from the year 44 B. C.[27]; and a very important Synod in A. D. 343-A. D. 344 (three years after the consulship of Marcellinus and Protinus in A. D. 341) referred the birth of Christ to less than 400 years before: "Christum . . . nostram carnem ex Virgine assumpsit, non integris abhinc quadringentis annis;"[28] this is later than B. C. 56.

---

[25] Clem. Alex. 1, c.

[26] The Apologies of Justin Martyr, edited by A. W. Blunt, M. A., Cambridge, 1911. Introduction, p. xlviii.

"Ignorantia consolatus, quo natus est Dominus et quo passus est nonnullos coegit errare ut putarent quadraginta sex annorum aetate passum esse Dominum, quia per tot annos aedificatum templum esse dictum est a Judaeis, quod imaginem Dominici corporis habebat."[29] By this statement of Augustine we learn: First, that some writers have regarded the age of Jesus as forty-six when He died, as St. Augustine affirms; or at some time during His ministry, when He was talking of His future resurrection, as seems more natural, according to the Gospel of St. John (xi., 20), to which this doctrine has reference; second, herein those writers differed from Irenaeus and Clement Alexandrinus, for in none of their works do we find a reference to such interpretation of that verse of St. John's Gospel; third, the idea that the years of the Temple were a figure of the years of the age of Jesus was then much pressed by its defenders, still St. Augustine was not able to deny it simply as inconsistent, but he tried to oppose to it another and a strange doctrine—that forty-six years was a figure of nine months;[30] fourth, this exegesis was probably suggested and sustained by the traditional accounts that Jesus was born as early as the time when Herod began the great work of rebuilding the Temple of the Lord during the eighteenth year of his reign,[31] B. C. 37-B. C. 20.

In the Acts of Pilate and in Sulpicius Severus[32] the death of Christ is attributed to the 18th and 19th year of Herod; this can be an anachronism by which they referred the death of Jesus to the year of Herod in which tradition had put His birth. That is not very much, but is certainly all we have as yet of traditional accounts on this point. All the other ancient accounts of the year of Jesus' birth being evidently false, no one of them can be traditional at all. Let the error be even of a few years only, the evidence remains that the year of Augustus in which they said Christ was born is not traditional. About that time Herod thought of building "The Temple of God, and making it larger in compass, and to raise it to a most magnificent height . . . and because it seemed incredible to hope . . . the king . . . told them he would not pull down their temple till all things were got ready for building it up again . . . Herod took up the old foundations and laid others, and erected the temple upon them."[33] Now, Jesus was born in time to be presented in the Temple built at the time of Darius Hystaspes.

---

[27] Ad Nationes I., 7.

[28] St. Athanasius Epistola De Synodis 26, 5.

[29] Augustinus in Doctrina Christiana II., 28.

[30] Cfr. Q. 83 c. 56; De Trinitate IV., 5.

[31] Josephus Ant. XV., II., i.

[32] Chronica II., 27.

According to the prophet: "Yet one little while and I will move the heaven, and the earth, and the sea and the dry land, and I will move all nations, and the desired of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts. . . . Great shall be the glory of this last house more than of the first, saith the Lord of hosts; and in this place I will give peace."[34] I must note that when the prophet says the glory of this last house shall be greater than that of the first one, such comparison cannot be applied to the place which was always the same, but to the second building itself, in opposition with the first building which had not enshrined the glory reserved to the second Temple. So the prophecy of Aggeus requires Jesus to be born in time to sanctify with His presence the Temple built at the time of Darius, and consequently to have been born about the time Herod began to rebuild the Temple.

Let us consider now the historical accounts. Jesus was born during the first census ordered by Augustus for all the world (Luke ii., 1). The first census of Augustus in Rome took place in B. C. 28, A. U. C. 726.[35] Historical circumstances show well enough how that census had been extended to all the world. Then Augustus "imperium in suas provincias decemnale suscepit, intra quod tempus eas redacturum in ordinem promittebat."[36] "Cæsar cum orationem de ejurando regno, ac dividendis provinciis habuisset . . ."[37] "Nam (Augustus) et omnia, ut conveniebat, emendavit, et pecunias aliis largitus est, aliis etiam ultra tributum novas imperavit."[38] Augustus "in Siciliam profectus est ut eam ac omnes alias ad Syriam usque provincias constitueret."[39] "Aberat in ordinandis Asiae Orientisque rebus Cæsar, circumferens terrarum orbi praesentia sua pacis suae bona."[40] "Vere in Asiam perrexit, A. Apulejo, P. Sillio consulibus; ibique et in Bithynia omnia constituit."[41] According to Josephus,[42]

---

[33] Josephus Ant. XV., XI., 8, 3.

[34] Aggeus II.

[35] Th. Mommsen, Res Gestae divi Augusti.

[36] Dio Historiae Romanae 53, 22.

[37] Dio 1, c.

[38] Dio 1, c. 54, 7.

[39] Dio 1, c.: 54, 6: A. U. C. 733.

[40] Vell. Hist. II., 92.

[41] Dio 1, c.: A. U. C. 734, B. C. 20.

[42] Ant. XV., 10, 3.

Augustus came into Syria, enlarged the kingdom of Herod, and appointed him one of the Procurators of Syria, when Herod had reigned seventeen years, i. e., about March B. C. 20. "Augustus interim subditos ex Romanorum legum praescripto composuit."[43] "De censu denique Augusti, quem testem fidelissimum dominicae nativitatis romana archiva custodiunt. . . . Sed et census constat actos[44] sub Augusto nunc in Judaea per Sentium Saturnimum."[45] Tertullian as a Christian never would have meant to correct St. Luke, and to say that the census had taken place not under Cyrenius, but under Saturninus, Governor of Syria. Sentius Saturninus was Consul B. C. 19, and to Saturninus, Consul, Tertullian refers the census that was finished, sent to Rome and signed by Saturninus in B. C. 19. The census was often regarded as a duty of the consuls in charge.[46]

Our Lord was born at the time of Cyrenius, Governor of Syria, who made then his first census in Judea.[47] Of Cyrenius we know that he took an army against the Homonades in order to subdue them, and also to avenge the death of a certain King Amyntas; "Amyntas itaque Ciremnem cepit, progressusque ad Omonades . . . multorum jam locorum dominus, interempto a se eorum tyranno, fraude uxoris tyranni captus est, atque ab illis interemptus."[48] "Cirenius autem eos fame confecit et quatuor millia a se capta in alias propinquas urbes traduxit, regionem vero juventute desertam reliquit."[49] Now, Cyrenius subdued the Homonades after the death of Amyntas, B. C. 25 and before the year B. C. 20: "Nam postquam Romani duce Quirinio effecerunt, quod Amyntas perficere non potuerat, ut (Homonades) domarentur, Cilicia aspera, ut ait Strabo 14, 5, 6, p. 671, regibus tradita est, scilicet a 734."[50] "Sic ergo Archelaus ad Cappadociam accepit asperam Ciliciam;"[51] "In Cilicia . . . maritimis quibusdam . . . quae Archelao . . . donavit."[52] If in B. C. 20 Augustus gave the region of the Homonades to King Archelaus, necessarily the region had been subdued by Cyrenius before that year. And then Cyrenius acted as Legate in Syria:

"Homonadenses angulum ad summum extremum Ciliciae occupantes . . . Ciliciam eo tempore sub praeside Syriae fuisse, olim a Baronio propositae . . . hodie vero . . . etiam a Zumptio et Nipperdeio admissae . . . dicendum erit Quirinium Homonadaenses vicisse Syriae legatum."[53]

---

[43] Seu descripsit—Dio 54, 9: A. U. C. 734; B. C. 20.

[44] Luc. II.

[45] Tertullianus Adversus Marcionem IV., 7, 19.

[46] *Cf.* Mommsen Res gestae divi Augusti II., 2.

[47] Luca II., 2.

[48] U. C. 729.

[49] Strabo 12, 6, 5.

[50] Dio 54, 9; Strabo 14, 5, 6, p. 671; Tacitus Ann. 6, 41. Mommsen Res gestae Augusti, P. S. Quirimi Titulus Tiburtinus III., 1.

[51] Strabo 1, c.

[52] Dio 1, c.; A. U. C. 724; B. C. 20.

When Dio[54] says that Agrippa sent the Legates into the Orient, obviously he means that Agrippa commanded the Legates of Augustus, who were traveling in his company, to proceed into the Orient without him. Agrippa, in fact, had no authority to appoint his own Legates. Also Agrippa was sent into the Orient by Augustus to take care of the most important affairs only, and this only to guard appearances, "sub specie ministeriorum principalium,"[55] the true reason being to have Agrippa far away from Rome; so the Legates of Augustus were still to remain in their respective provinces of Asia, at least to take care of all ordinary affairs.

Because it is historically evident that Augustus gave the region of the Homonades to King Archelaus in B. C. 20, it is also evident that at that time Cyrenius had already subdued them.

Tacitus says: "Quirinus . . . impiger militiae et acribus ministeriis consulatum sub divo Augusto mox, expugnatis per Ciliciam Homonadensium castellis, insignia triumphi adeptus;"[56] that is, Cyrenius, after he had done hard work in war and in civil offices, was elected Consul, and soon, by the reason that he had subdued the Homonades, the triumph was allowed to him. In fact, Cyrenius was "homo novus," and before his consulship he could not obtain the honor of a triumph: "Nam legatus . . . neque hac aetate jus ei triumphandi."[57] The Senate twice ordained prayers of thanksgiving, "supplicationes binas,"[58] because of the victories of Cyrenius over the Homonades, once after those victories and again at the occasion of the triumph of Cyrenius.

In B. C. 1 Cyrenius was appointed adviser to C. Cæsar, who by a decree of the Senate was obtaining the duty to govern Armenia: "C. Cæsar, in Syriam missus, convento prius Tib. Nerome, cui omnem honorem, ut superiori, habuit."[59] "(Tiberius) Privignum Gaium Orienti Praepositum, cum visendi gratia trajecisset Samum, alienorem sibi sensit ex criminationibus M. Lollii comitis et rectoris eius."[60] "Datusque (Quirinus) rector C. Cæsari Armeniam optinenti Tiberium quoque Rhodi agentem coluerat, quod tunc patefecit in senatu, laudatis in se officiis et incusato M. Lollio, quen auctorem

---

[53] Mommsen 1, c. III., 1.

[54] Hist. Rom. 53, 32.

[55] Vell. 2, 93.

[56] Am. III., 48.

[57] Mommsen 1, c.

[58] Mommsen 1, c.

[59] Vell. II., 101.

[60] Suetonius in Tiberium 12.

Caio Cæsari pravitatis et discordiarum arguebat."[61] Now, if Lollius had induced C. Cæsar to pay reverence to Tiberius at Rhodes, Tiberius would not have made the reported accusations against him; moreover, in no way could the conduct of Lollius be compared with that of Cyrenius, had not he (Cyrenius) influenced the feelings of C. Cæsar and induced him to pay reverence to Tiberius at Rhodes. Hence it follows that Cyrenius was the first adviser of C. Cæsar in B. C. 1—not Lollius, as Mommsen says.

It was only about B. C. 26 that Varro subdued a part of the region of Zenodorus which was given to Herod: "Ille (Cæsar) rescripsit expugnanda esse latronum receptacula, et regionem eam ditioni Herodis contribuenda . . . eam regionem postea Herodes accepit a Cæsare, adhibitis ducibus ad eos penetrans maleficia coercuit . . . Zenodorus autem . . . Roman ad accusandum Herodem profectus est. . . . Interea in Asiam Agrippa mittitur (B. C. 23). . . . Zenodorus . . . periit. Cæsar vero et huius portionem, sane non contemnendam, donavit Herodi."[62]

To conclude, the historical evidence is that Cyrenius had to subdue the Homonades no later than B. C. 20; the geographical evidence is that Cyrenius was at that time Legate in Syria; such is also the historical evidence, because we do not know any other office of Cyrenius in Asia, but that he was Proconsul there once and Legate in Syria twice ("iterum"); he could not be Proconsul until after his consulship in B. C. 12; in A. D. 6 he was again Legate in Syria; and in B. C. 20 he only could be Legate in Syria the first time.

Cyrenius was not Legate in Syria in about B. C. 7 or B. C. 5. We have seen by historical evidence that he was Legate there in about B. C. 20, and to admit that he was Legate in Syria again in B. C. 7 or B. C. 5, we should admit that he was Legate there three times, which is not admissible. Also in B. C. 7 and B. C. 5 we know that Saturninus and Varus respectively were Legates in Syria. In the hypothesis that while one was Legate some other could have been sent to make the census, then the civil official in charge of the census in no way was governing the region. It could not disagree with St. Luke if Saturninus or any other was in Syria to make the census; but as to Cyrenius, he was governing Syria; that is, he was the Legate or President. Had Cyrenius been a procurator, he could have governed some particular region of Syria, but he could not have been said to govern Syria.

The hypothesis that Cyrenius was Governor after Varus and finished the census first begun by Saturninus is not only too strange of itself; but in such an hypothesis we cannot understand why St.

---

[61] Tacitus, Ann. III., 48.

[62] Josephus XV., 13.

Luke does not name Varus, who, it is supposed, was the actual Legate, and by whom the Holy Family had been really enrolled.

At the very time of the presence of Augustus in Syria all the world was at peace: "Itaque tunc temporis nullum bellum attigit."[63]

The result is that some old traditional and exegetical accounts, prophecy and history fully harmonize in testifying to the birth of Jesus about the year B. C. 20. From April 14, B. C, 20, to the destruction of Jerusalem in April 14, A. D. 70, are 89 intervening years; there are 89×365=32,485 days+22 days of intercalary years=32,507 days+202 days counted from September 24, B. C. 21 to April 14, B. C. 20=32,709 days: 7=4,672 weeks and 5 days: 24 classes of Jewish priests=to 194 turns and 16 weeks more. At the destruction of Jerusalem the 24th class was serving in the Temple; and the remainder 16 weeks in B. C. 21 the last 16 classes were performing service in the Temple, counting from the 24th back to the ninth class; and the five days over the number of 4,672 weeks belonged to the service of the eighth class, to which St. Zaccarias belonged, and which was serving in the Temple on September 24 until about September 29. At the beginning of October St. John could have been conceived; during the month of March was the Annunciation; and the birth of Christ had to take place between December 4 to about January 4; B. C. 20 is in perfect agreement with the traditional statement of the birth of Christ on December 25.

As far as we know, no one of the fathers ever advanced any historical or traditional statement to prove the true year of the birth of Our Lord. The years 42d and 43d or 28th and 29th of Augustus were calculated from the time of the baptism of Jesus, attributed by those fathers to fifteen years after the death of Augustus.

INFANCY OF JESUS.

Jesus went into Egypt after the age of twelve years, as the Blessed Virgin revealed to a pious man about A. D. 1296: "In ea (in His Mother's house) conceptus et usque ad fugam in Aegyptum semper educatus."[64] "In dicta camera nutrivit dilecetissimum Filium suum usquequo pervenit ad aetatem duodecim annorum."[65] "Ubi ipsum suum Primogenitum . . . lactavit et educavit."[66]

A Jewish tradition relates Jesus had been in Egypt at His early manhood.[67] Agreeing with the same statement is an account of

---

[63] Dio. 1., c. 54, 9.

[64] A very ancient tablet in the sanctuary of Loretto by transcription of Beato Spagnoli.

[65] The very same tablet by transcription of Teramano.

[66] Julius II., Bulla October 21, 1507.

[67] Jewish Encyclopedia—Jesus in Jewish Legend.

Origen that an occasion of scandal to the Jews, according to Celsus, was the fact that Jesus was poor and even had been in service in Egypt: "And now Our Jesus is reproached with being born in a village, and that not a Greek one, nor belonging to any nation widely esteemed, and is despised as the son of a poor laboring woman, for having on account of His poverty left His native country and hired Himself out as a servant in Egypt . . . He has yet been able to shake the whole inhabited world."[68] Origen repeats several times the Jewish tradition that Jesus was a servant in Egypt. Cfr. Lamentations (v. 6, 7): "We have given our hand to Egypt and to Assyrians, that we might be satisfied with bread. Our fathers have sinned and are not, and we have borne their iniquities." In St. Matthew the first verse, chapter 2, can be translated in this way: "Because Jesus had been born in Bethlehem of Juda, in the days of King Herod, behold, there came wise men from the East to Jerusalem." This verse refers to Matt. ii., 5, 8. The Gospel of St. Matthew, according to some ancient manuscripts, always calls Jesus "ton paida" (ii., 11, 13, 14, 20, 21: Novum Testamentum graece curavit Eberhard Nestle) because Jesus was then a boy. In the same manuscripts, however, Herod calls Jesus an infant (ii., 8), because he believed so; but it might have been a mistake of Herod to argue at first that Christ had been born at the same time as the appearance of His star. Some very ancient images in the catacombs show Jesus a boy sitting on a large throne at the visitation of Magi.[69] Also in the Church of Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome a mosaic made by order of Pope Sixtus III. represents Jesus sitting on a large throne at the visitation of Magi.[70] Perhaps God did not send the star to the Magi until Jesus was twelve years old. The Magi did not need the star to guide them, were they going to Bethlehem; but they were guided to Nazareth, where, according to St. Luke, Jesus was then living. The reason why St. Matthew avoids saying where the Magi met Jesus seems to be the fact that the holy writer is not willing to explain how the Holy Family was living in Nazareth and how occasionally Jesus was born in Bethlehem. Also because the Evangelist there cares more for what was accomplished of the prophecies. Then the reason why Jesus soon went into Egypt was because Herod could readily receive information from Bethlehem of the wonderful events that happened there at the true date of the birth of Christ and at His presentation in the Temple of Jerusalem, and also that Magi had gone to Nazareth.

---

[68] Origen against Celsus I., 29.

[69] *Cf.* Knabenbauer comm. in Mattheum II.

[70] *Cf.* Garrucci, Storia dell' Arte Christiana Roma, 1872, I., p. 363; also Tav. 213.

I wish to note here that the Gospels were not written like all other historical books. Every evangelist wanted to give an account of the knowledge of common Christian people at the Apostolic time, because they wanted to base the historical value of the events related in their Gospels on the testimony of all Christian believers, so that the evidence of those events should remain greater than an historical evidence. Hence one evangelist says that at Jericho Jesus cured a blind man; another that He cured there two blind men on two different occasions; and a third evangelist says that Jesus cured there two blind men, uniting in one account two different events. Because the Apostles in their sermons could not always distinguish all the circumstances, and the Gospels are a faithful picture of the Apostles' sermons, and of the consequences of a little variant knowledge of the faithful. Also what in the Gospels is related is all historical; the form, however, is oratorical, not historical, and the oratorical form requires sometimes a certain carelessness in useless circumstances; sometimes requires a changing of chronological circumstances for the unity of an argument or for any honest purpose of the speaker.

So the tradition that the Magi had come when Jesus was two years old (what in Jewish language only means after the first of Nisan, next to His birth) does not appear very certain. But it can be argued also that Jesus at the first flight from Bethlehem to Nazareth.

At the age of twelve years Jesus remained in the Temple, "sitting in the midst of the doctors, hearing them and asking them questions. And all that heard Him were astonished at His wisdom and his answers. . . . And His Mother said to Him: Son, why hast thou done so to us? . . . And he said to them: How is it that you sought me? did you not know that I must be about my Father's business? And they understood not the words He spoke unto them." If the Blessed Virgin did not understand what her Divine Son had said, this means that she did not hear His words. Jesus apparently addressed His parents, but He wanted to be heard by the doctors, to signify to them that He professed to be the Son of God. And after this manifestation of Jesus it became necessary to fly into Egypt. That St. Matthew does not distinguish the two flights of Jesus there is no wonder at all, as we well know the evangelist did not want to give a full history of the infancy of Jesus, for he shows a clear aim to be brief, his chief concern being how much of prophecies was accomplished.

Jesus remained several years in Egypt: "Dicitur quia septem annis mansit in Aegypto."[71]

---

[71] S. Thomas, comm. in Mattheum II.

DATE OF THE BAPTISM.

"Under the high priest Annas (A. D. 6-A. D. 14) and Caiphas (A. D. 16-A. D. 33) . . ." (Luke iii., 2.) "(Plural high priests) is a manifest correction on account of the two names."[72] "In the high priesthood of Annas and Caiphas, yet so that the high priest is spoken of in the singular number."[73] It appears that the name of Caiphas there was first interpolated, and afterwards the reading of the second verse was changed according to that interpolation.

Commentators say here that St. Luke calls Annas a high priest when he was not. But by interpreting the Gospel in this way we shall always remain subject to our own imaginations and never be able to find out the truth. Such is the evidence of the third Gospel, that St. John began to preach at the time of the high priest Annas (Ananus) (A. D. 6-A. D. 14). In the Acts (iv., 6), however, the name of Annas, like a family name, can be attributed not to Ananus himself, but to his son Jonathas, who succeeded Caiphas before the death of Herod Philip, in about A. D. 33, or even at an earlier date, in the hypothesis that Tiberius had sent Gratus in Judea when he received by the Senate the administration of the Provinces in about A. D. 11, according to Velleius, or in A. D. 13, according to Suetonius.

As to St. John (xviii., 24) he always means to refer the title of high priest to Caiphas. 'Et misit eum Annas ligatum ad Caipham pontificem—q. d. Miserat autem Annas Jesum ligatum ad Caipham pontificem. Ita Syrus, Arabicus et Cyrillus. Est enim hysterologia. Nam Joannes quasi oblitus narrare missionem Jesu ab Anna ad Caipham, hic eam interserit, ut indicet quis fuerit pontifex qui examinavit Iesum cujus minister alapam dedit eidem, nimirum fuisse Caipham, non Annam. Caiphas enim erat pontifex, non Annas; quare hic versus recto ordine ponendus est post vers. 13, nam trina negatio Petri et examen Jesus, omnia quae post vers. 13 narrat Joannes, contigerunt in domo Caiphas ponticicis, non Annae, ut patet ex S. Mattheo, Marco et Luca."[74] And also, according to St. John, it is clear that Peter remained always in the same place "warming himself" (xviii., 18, 25).

St. John began to preach, probably, about the first year of Annas, who was appointed high priest by a Roman Legate, Cyrenius, on A. D. 6. It seems most fitting that when Judea was becoming a Roman Province, losing every kind of liberty, God should send the greatest of the prophets of Israel to preach a new-coming liberty and a new kingdom from heaven. Cf. Genesis ixl.: "Non auferetur sceptrum de Juda, et dux de femore ejus, donec veniat qui venturus est, et ipse erit expectatio gentium."

---

[72] The Gospel According to Luke, by J. J. Van Oosterzes, D. D., translated by P. Schaaf, D. D., and Rev. C. C. Starbuck.

[73] The Holy Bible, edited by F. C. Cook, M. A., London, 1878.

[74] Cornelli A. Lapide Comm. In Joannem.

St. Luke (ii., 52; iii., 1) states that Jesus advanced in wisdom and age, and (in His own) grace with God and men, in the year 15 of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea, etc. The evangelist wants to say not that Jesus grew in wisdom and age, this being a natural necessity to every boy. St. Luke refers to the adolescence of Jesus, that He was subject to His parents; then he states that Jesus manifested a doctrine (wisdom), lived with men (age) and had charity (grace) advancing; that is, accomplishing His mission, in the year 15 of Tiberius, i. e., from Nisan A. D. 28 to Nisan A. D. 29, calculating in the Jewish way. The verb to advance is used by St. Luke to signify that Jesus had preached also before that year, and that He progressed in His ministry, preaching His full and clearest doctrine and showing the best signs of love only at the end.

To refer to the year 15 of Tiberius the high priesthood of Annas, the reading of the second verse could be: Annas being high priest, and not as it reads in fact, "under Annas high priest." At Rome they have a letter attributed to Lentulus, Procurator of Judea and predecessor of Pilate, speaking of the features, the fame and the miracles of Christ. This letter, even if not genuine, is an evident testimony of the Christian belief at the time of its composition that Christ had begun His ministry before Pilate was Procurator of Judea, and consequently before the 15th year of Tiberius. St. Justin says: "Ne qui . . . . Christum dicant ante annos centum quinquaginta nos asseverare Christum sub Cyrenio natum esse, docuisse autem quae dicimus ipsum posterius docuisse sub Pontio Pilato."[75]

If St. Justin and the Christians were referring to the time of Pilate the things Jesus had preached at a later time, it means that other things had been preached by Jesus at an earlier time before Pilate was sent to govern Judea, agreeing with the age of Jesus of forty years at least, as was asserted by St. Justin, and has been stated above. Besides, of a man under the age of thirty-five we would not say that he is advancing in age. Also that Jesus advanced in wisdom with men from twelve to thirty years of age cannot be said, because during the obscure life of Jesus men could not acknowledge His wisdom, or rather His advancing wisdom. Such advances must be referred to the teaching of Our Lord and to His later age. The Valentinians were right in saying that St. Luke refers the ministry of Jesus to the 15th year of Tiberius; but they were wrong in arguing that Jesus was baptized, preached and died during only twelve months, in the year 15 of Tiberius. The word "advancing" can neither imply the very end[76] nor the beginning of Our Lord's ministry. The advancing in the ministry supposes a preceding duration of the same; the advancing in the ministry in the very year 15 of Tiberius means the last year of advance. The more an event is approaching to its completion, the more it is advancing, while the completion itself and the beginning of an event do not belong to its advance. St. Luke also especially shows his purpose of giving the account of the last year of Our Lord's ministry. Accordingly, he speaks first of the imprisonment of St. John and after of the baptism of Jesus; he begins the ministry of Christ at Nazareth, when His fame had already gone through the whole country (Luke iv., 14); and after only a third of his account has been related, he does state that the days of Christ's assumption (i. e., of His death) were accomplishing (Luke ix., 51), and begins to relate Jesus' last journey to Jerusalem.

---

[75] Apologia I., 46.

According to the consecutive order of feasts related by St. John, the ministry of Jesus occupied a year; when he says that the miracle of the multiplication of bread took place near the Passover time, he is relating there what happened at some preceding year. Although the evangelists relate the last year of the ministry of Christ, they take the liberty of reporting miracles from all the effective preaching of Our Lord. The duration of one year belongs to the book, not to the events which the book refers to. In other words, the evangelists give an account of one year, preferably of the last year, of the preaching of Our Lord, as an example of every year of His ministry; and also in the duration of one year they relate sermons and miracles from all the ministry of Christ, so as to give a complete picture of His gradual mission.

St. Mark and St. Matthew relate especially of the ministry of Christ in Galilee; St. Luke the ministry of Christ in Galilee and also an occasional preaching through Samaria. It is not according to the charity of Jesus to presume that He would have denied His grace and doctrine to all the country because those of one village would not receive Him; Jesus went into another village, but He still remained in Samaria. St. John relates especially of the ministry of Christ in Judea.

The date of the baptism of Jesus is near His thirtieth year of age (Luke iii., 23), about A. D. 10. Christian tradition was not silent as to the baptism of Jesus before A. D. 14, that is, at the time of Annas and before the death of Augustus. "Si modo tueris sectam illam, quae cum imperio educata, et cum Augusto simul inchoata est."[77] Not from the birth, but from the ministry of Jesus, St. Melito can calculate the beginning of the Christian sect.

---

[76] Nisan A. D. 29.

"Principe Augusto nomen hoc ortum est, Tiberio disciplina eius illuxit, sub Nerome damnatio invalvuit."[78] The name of Christ, or better, the name of "Christian sect" arose at the time of Augustus. But Christ had no renown and no followers during His private life; Tertulliam, therefore, refers to the first preaching of Christ.

The Gospel is addressed to all mankind. The Evangelists told us sufficiently of the chronology of Our Lord, born "at the times of King Herod" (B. C. 37-B. C. 4), "Cyrenius being Governor of Syria" (B. C. 23 and after); beginning to preach "under Annas, high priest" (A. D. 6-A. D. 14); lasting or "advancing . . . in the year 15 of Tiberius" (A. D. 28-A. D. 29), being "not yet fifty years old." But the composition of all the Gospel is adapted to common people, to whom simplified, short and not numerous accounts is a necessity, as simple geographical references and a plain tale helps their intelligence and remembrance of the facts. You cannot teach the people in church like you can teach pupils at school. I wish to note also how the chief history in the Gospel is the Passion and Resurrection of Christ; all the rest looks more like an introdutcion and explanation to that history. If chapter viii. of the book against the Jews is genuine (and this is doubtful), the statement there of the age of Jesus of thirty years means that Tertullian changed view after his defection from the Catholic faith.

"Augustus qui imperavit Romae . . . Hoc imperante advenit Joannes Zacariae sacerdotis filius, missus a Deo praedicans baptismum paenitentiae. . . . Exinde coepit Jesus docere populum et facere virtutes et signa magna . . . deinde Tiberius Cæsar imperavit annis viginti duobus. Hoc imperante, idest sextodecimo anno imperii ejus . . . Filius Dei passus est."[79] "Cum primum coepit adolescere tinctus est a Joanne propheta in Jordane flumine."[80] Lactantius appears to conclude from Luke iii., 1, that the Baptist began to preach in the 15th year of his age and under the administration of Tiberius. That Jesus was baptized at the beginning of His thirtieth year is evident by the Gospel (Luke iii., 23) as well as by tradition, "Dominus enim Jesus Christus tricesimo anno baptizatus est et coepit docere."[81] The foolish statement of the great Lactantius shows that the tradition of the baptism of Jesus at the time of Augustus was yet strong, and being unable to make historical conclusions agree with both traditions of the first preaching of the Baptist at the time of Augustus and of the age of Jesus as thirty years at His baptism, he decided to retain the first account and renounce the second.

---

[77] St. Melito Fragmenta ex apologia cf. Eusebius Hist. Eccl. IV., 26: Ruffinus Hist. Eccl. IV., 24; Nicephorus Hist. Eccl. IV., 10.

[78] Tertullianus Ad Nationes I., 7.

[79] Anonymi Libellus De Paschali Observatione, Migne Patrologia ser. I., vol. 59.

[80] Lactantius Instit. divin. IV., 15.

[81] Conc. Neocaes. can. IX.

"Doctrina vero (seu praedicatio) Domini per praesentiam (seu in adventu) incepta temporibus Augusti et Tiberii Cæsaris, perfectionem obtinuit circa media tempora (Tiberii) Augusti. Apostolorum autem ejus doctrina, usque ad Pauli ministerium Neronis tempore consummatur."[82]

Whatsoever be the difficulty of this passage, it remains absolutely evident that Clement refers the first preaching of Jesus to the time of Augustus. That is the only reason for mentioning the name of Augustus.

The coming of Christ on this earth from heaven was at His Incarnation and at His birth; but the coming of Christ to His mission or to His public ministry, His acknowledged coming, was at His baptism, when He manifested Himself to men. To refer the preaching of Christ to the time of His birth was impossible to Clement, and to interpret in that way would be foolish. To the evidence of all the referred passages of Clement, Lactantius, Tertullian and St. Melito we must note that propriety of language is the only means we have to know the ideas of any writers. In Strom. I., 21, p. 147, Clement attributes to Jesus the ministry of only one Jewish year. Which is his true personal opinion? Clement begins that chapter (21) in the book I. by saying: "Postulat tamen commentarius, ut nos quoque ea percurramus, quae in hoc argumentum (de temporibus) dicta sunt,"[83] and concludes in the following way: "Et quae de temporibus quidem varie a multis scripta, et a nobis exposita fuerunt, sic habeant."[84] Clement, therefore, advances there what other authors had written before him. We must also note that Clement, although he never argued from tradition, in order to fight against heretics with their own arms, his doctrine is always most faithful to Christian tradition. How can we attribute to Clement an heretical doctrine incompatible with St. John's Gospel? If Clement did not reject the fourth Gospel like the Valentinians, and he never did, he never professed the preaching of Jesus as lasting only twelve months.

Christian tradition referred the death of Our Lord to the 15th year of Tiberius after the death of Augustus (A. D. 29).[85] The baptism of Jesus in A. D. 29, then, cannot be traditional at all, and was only inferred by a false interpretation given to Luke iii., 1. The baptism of Jesus at the time of Augustus remains the only date which can vindicate the Christian tradition, as also it is the only one agreeing with the high priesthood of Annas.

---

[82] Clement Alexandrinus Strom. VII., 17, pg. 325.

[83] Strom. I., 21, p. 138.

[84] Strom. I., 22, p. 147.

[85] Origen, Ps. Tertullian, Lactantius, Hippolytus (?), Acts of Pilate, Augustine.

THE AGE OF JESUS AND DURATION OF HIS MINISTRY.

In the Gospel of St. John (viii., 57) we read how the Jews said to Jesus: "Thou art not yet fifty years old and hast thou seen Abraham?" Now, when somebody denies the age of fifty years, he concedes an age of over forty years. St. John in that verse tells us that Jesus some time during His ministry was over forty years.[86] We are never justified in presuming that words are used foolishly. Unless we take St. John's words in their obvious meaning, must we not say that he remembered sixty years afterwards and noted in the Gospel an idle word? On the other hand, we know that the evangelists had more regard for the real meaning of the word than for the material circumstances.

According to the Gospel of St. Luke (iii., 1, 2), the Baptist preached during the high priesthood of Annas (A. D. 6-14 ; and Jesus died during the high priesthood of Caiphas (A. D. 17-33).

By the Passovers named in the fourth Gospel, however, we would argue the restrictive number of years Jesus preached. But if we give way to reflection, evidently none of the three Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Mark nor St. Luke is exhaustive; and this is a right basis from which to argue that neither is the Gospel of St. John exhaustive. The idea that the Passovers named in the Gospel are exhaustive is a presumption; but evidently no presumption has any right against positive accounts, as are in this case the Gospel narrative adduced above.

Again, at the end of St. John's Gospel we read: "There are many other things which Jesus did, which, if they were written, every one, the whole world itself, I think, would not be able to contain the books that should be written." (John xxi., 25.) If under the figurative meaning this expression conveys a true meaning, we must conclude that the miracles and sermons related in St. John's Gospel are very few in comparison with all the miracles that Jesus worked and the sermons that He preached; and the Passovers related in the same Gospel are only few in comparison with all the Passovers at which Jesus was really present; and in consequence of that expression in the Gospel of St. John, absolutely nothing can be presumed exhaustive. Jesus "appeared in another shape to two of them. . . . And they going, told it to the rest; neither did they believe them." (Mark xvi., 12, 13.) "They went back to

---

[86] *Cfr.* Irenaeus Against Haeresies, II., 22.

Jerusalem; and they found the eleven gathered together, and those that were with them, saying: The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon." (Luke xxiv., 33, 34.) It appears here clearly that St. Luke, according to the custom of the writers of that time, made the Disciples say what the author himself wants to tell the reader. By St. Mark's writing it is evident that they did not yet believe in the resurrection of Christ. This passage of St. Luke is of great consequence to the interpretation of St. John viii., 51.

St. John has another expression also alluding to a long ministry, when Jesus said: "Have I been so long a time with you, and have you not known Me?" (xiv., 9.)

Thence we can conclude that the Gospels (conducted like a dramatical work) give just an epitome of the ministry of Jesus.

Against the Valentinians, Irenaeus argues from John (viii., 57) that (some time during His ministry) Jesus was at least forty years old. Irenaeus also says Jesus had come to sanctify every age; and He had lived and sanctified old age.[87] Again by the tradition that Jesus died in His old age, Irenaeus argues against the heretics that Jesus, when He fulfilled His ministry, was over forty years old, for it is impossible to judge a man old who is under forty years of age. And what is the expression of the tradition is "the (nearly) old age which Our Lord possessed while He still fulfilled the office of a teacher, even as the Gospel and all the elders testify; those who were conversant in Asia with John the Disciple of the Lord, (affirming) that John conveyed to them that information. And he remained among them till the times of Trajan (A. D. 98-A. D. 117). Some of them, moreover, saw not only John, but the other Apostles also, and heard the very same account from them, and bear testimony as to (the validity of) the statement."[88]

This account of St. Irenaeus gives us the first ancient tradition regarding the age of Our Lord and the only one tradition presuming to repeat the thought of the Apostle St. John and also of the other Apostles. This clear statement of a writer like St. Irenaeus, referring to the express relation of elders of his own time, has a high and absolute historical value. The positive and clear account given by all the elders of Asia Minor referring to the teaching of the Apostles, related by the very hearers of the Apostles themselves, is a statement of full philosophical evidence, to which no objection can be logically made.

The expression of St. Irenaeus, "as all the elders testify," cannot mean only two, or only a few elders; but it absolutely implies many elders. It is also a great mistake to interpret that St. Irenaeus refers to some hearers of the Apostles still living at that time; St. Irenaeus refers there to all the living elders of Asia in general: "The church in Ephesus, founded by Paul, and having John remaining among them permanently until the time of Trajan, is a true witness of the tradition of the Apostles."[89] Of Polycarp, evidently the last of the hearers of the Apostles, St. Irenaeus says: "To these things (taught by Polycarp) all the Asiatic Churches testify, as do also those men who have succeeded Polycarp down to the present time."[90] Of the hearers of the Apostles, no one could be still living at the time St. Irenaeus wrote. The living Christians and Bishops were testifying to the doctrine of the hearers of the Apostles, now dead. The elders of Asia were still able to remember and testify to the express and absolute teaching of the very hearers of St. John, and in this way they were still able to testify that such a doctrine had surely come from the Apostles themselves.

---

[87] Against Her. II., XXII.

[88] Irenaeus 1, c.

It likewise appears impossible that in the second century the churches in the world would not conserve any memory of the age of Jesus. They had everywhere some tradition of this sort. The tradition of the churches of that time was not of the age of thirty-three or thirty-four years, for in all that century we find no account of it. The opinion that was then common, among other heretical authors, that the age of Jesus at His death was thirty years, such an opinion was so far from being a Christian tradition that St. Irenaeus attributed its origin to only one man, Ptolomæus, saying: "Whom, then, should we rather believe? Whether such men as these (the hearers of the Apostles) or Ptolomæus, who never saw the Apostles, and who never even in his dreams attained to the slightest trace of an Apostle?"[91] The tradition only remains in the churches of the Catholic world of the second century that Jesus preached for a long period until He died under Tiberius and under Pontius Pilate in His nearly old age.

Says St. Irenaeus: "Ad hanc enim ecclesiam (Romanum) propter potentiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est eos qui sunt undique fideles: in qua semper ab his qui sunt undique conservata est ea quae est ab Apostolis traditio."[92] "Convenire as signifying motion cannot be applied to a church."[93] Now, if, in the doctrine of St. Irenaeus, every church and every faithful must necessarily concur with the Church of Rome, it is not possible that St. Irenaeus himself professed and defended the nearly old age of Jesus against a contrary tradition professed by the Romans.

---

[89] Against Heresies 3, 3, 4.

[90] *Loc. cit.*

[91] *Loc. cit.*

[92] Contra Haer. III., 3.

[93] Kendrick, Primacy of the Apostolic See, VIII.

That the age of Jesus was about fifty years was then believed also at Rome.

Were then existing a tradition that Jesus' age was about thirty-three years, this could have supported the Gospel of St. John just the same; then, why did not St. Irenaeus oppose to the Valentinians both the traditions of about fifty and thirty-three years of the age of Christ? But the age of Our Lord of thirty-three years was ignored in the second century. If we give way to reflection, it appears impossible that St. Irenaeus should have ignored the tradition of the Church of Rome, that he should have made it more difficult for the heretics to understand their error while he was going so far from their opinion; that he ventured to depart from the common view and tradition, rejecting and offending every other view, and all because of a mistake he might have read in Papias. But even if such an absurd conclusion be conceded, then Papias, a true hearer of the Apostles, was the only one to ignore the age of Our Saviour. And in this second absurd hypothesis, either Papias wrote that he had learned the age of Jesus as being near fifty years from the very mouth of St. John, and what he said was false, and then he was a liar; or Papias did not write such a thing, and then St. Irenaeus is false, both in distinguishing those hearers who had learned the age of Jesus from St. John only from others who had learned it from other Apostles also; and in affirming that (in the hypothesis) Papias had learned the age of Jesus from St. John and was giving testimony as to the validity of his statement. And this again is absurd, because of the sanctity and seriousness of Irenaeus, and because those of Asia would have surely convinced him of its falsity.

It is important to note that St. Irenaeus always was well known, and never was there a holy writer who assumed the right to oppose his traditional account of the age of Jesus.

They say that St. Irenaeus referred the death of Christ to the year 41st of Augustus. But St. Irenaeus in no way refers this statement to tradition, to which the doctrinal mistake of St. Irenaeus cannot give any prejudice. And St. Irenaeus says expressly that Jesus at His baptism was beginning his thirtieth year of age; and this statement is incompatible with the birth of Christ in the 41st of Augustus, and the baptism, as is supposed, in the 15th year of Tiberius. And then St. Irenaeus was the only one to ignore what every Christian knew, that Christ died under Tiberius. But so many centuries of an historical mistake could not save from few interpolations on this point of the Chronology of Christ.

In a later passage St. Irenaeus appeals (not to all the elders, just) to the elders who had seen John (but who had not seen the other Apostles: Ag. H. V., xxxiii., 3), meaning their oral account: "Quemadmodum presbiteri meminerunt, qui Joannem discipulum Domini viderunt;" and appeals also to the writings of Papias (V., xxxiii., 4): "Haec autem et Papias . . . per scripturam testimonium perhibet" about the millennium time. It is well known that the doctrine of the millennium was not peculiar to St. Irenaeus, but very popular; and it appears unjust to appeal to this later passage of St. Irenaeus in order to diminish the absolute value of the Apostolic tradition of the old age of Jesus, referred to in the same work of St. Irenaeus and related as above.

As to the millennium, by the wonderful words attributed to Jesus about those happy times, we are only told that the common welfare then will be superior to every human expectation. In a like manner God had called Palestine "a land flowing with milk and honey." (Exodus iii., 8, 17, etc.) The reigning of Jesus means a complete triumph of His doctrine. We must distinguish tradition from doctrine, and not deny the right of tradition, because of wrong doctrine concluded from it.

The long duration of Our Lord's ministry has been variously testified to: 1. St. Irenaeus, interpreting the baptism of Jesus to have taken place in the year 30 of His age, extended the ministry until the age of about fifty years; 2. Clement, Tertullian, our Anonymous, St. Melito, referring the baptism to a period before the death of Augustus Octavianus, extended the ministry through the middle of the period of Tiberius' reign; 3. Lactantius referring the baptism of Jesus to fifteen years, extended the ministry until beyond the age of thirty years; 4. Some writers referred to by St. Augustine extended the ministry from the age of Jesus of thirty years until the age of forty-six, when He died.

DATE OF THE DEATH OF JESUS.

According to Valentinians, Jesus preached one Jewish year and died in the 15th year of Tiberius A. D. 35, or He was dead forty-two years and three months before the destruction of Jerusalem,[94] in A. D. 28; according to Origen, Ps. Tertullian, etc., Jesus preached one year and a few months and died in A. D. 29. Ps. Cyprian refers the death of Jesus to A. D. 30. St. Jerome, St. Chrysostom, St. Epiphanius, etc., attributed to Our Lord a ministry of over two years and His death to A. D. 31. Dionysius assigned to the ministry three years and three months until the death of Jesus in March A. D. 34. Bacon R.[95] again attributed to Our Lord's ministry, the duration of over two years and His death in A. D. 33.

---

[94] Clem. Alex. Strom. I., 147.

[95] Opus Majus 1, c.

No one of all those accounts can give us the true year of the death of Jesus, for every one of them depended upon the false interpretation that Our Lord had been baptized fifteen years after the death of Octavianus. Nevertheless, the most accredited date of Our Lord's death remains A. D. 29, as the most ancient and the most authoritative views.[96] According to Theophilus, the resurrection of Jesus took place on Sunday, Nisan 15, March 25: "Nam Galli quacunque die viii. Calendas Aprilis fuisset quando Christi resurrectio fuisse tradebatur, pascha semper celebrabant . . . die dominico verno tempore in aequinotio, luna plena."[97] According to Beda, the 15th of Nisa fell on Sunday, March 25, in A. D. 31. "Nam si VIII. calendarum Aprilis . . . et luna fuit XV. non potuit hoc esse, ut Beda scribit libro temporum, nisi fuisset XIII. annus cycli decemnovennalis (A. D. 31); et hoc est verum. Quia secundum hoc oportuit quod aureus numereus fuerit XIII., ut luna diceretur prima in calendario, ubi XIII. scribuntur, quatenus ab illo loco computetur aetas lunae, ut inveniatur XV. in VIII. calendarum Aprilis . . . Dominus fuit natus in secundo anno cycli . . . inveniemus VIII. calendarum in passione esse in dominica."[98]

This statement, however, is absolutely contradicted by the Gospel, which attributes to Nisan 15, "the first day of the Azymes," the Last Supper of Jesus, not His resurrection. Nevertheless, by this tradition we can learn that in the year of the death of Jesus the Nisan 15 fell, perhaps, on Sunday. St. Epiphanius states that Jesus was betrayed on Tuesday, Nisan 11, March 17; He died on Friday, Nisan 14, March 20, and arose from the dead on Sunday, Nisan 16, March 22.[99] From St. Epiphanius we can learn that a few days, perhaps, interceded between the betrayal of Jesus and His death.

Clement of Alexandria says of those who were inquiring (by astronomical accounts) of the exact day of the death of Jesus, attributing it to March 21, or April 20 or April 14. That no one of these accounts were traditional is evident by the fact that Clement of Alexandria equally despised all the three opinions.

The Latin doctors referred the death of Jesus to Friday, Nisan 15, March 25, while astronomy shows that in all the possible years of the death of Our Lord never a Friday coincided both with Nisan 15 and March 25.

I think we can be able to find out the day of the month of Nisan if we read the Gospel with reflection rather than divination. St. John (xiii., 1) can talk of the supper done at Betania on Nisan 13

---

[96] *Cfr.* Hastings, D. D., A Dictionary of the Holy Bible, Chronology of N. T.

[97] Beda De Ordinatione feriarum paschalium.

[98] Bacon R. Opus Majus, 1. c.

[99] Ag. Haeresies, 51, 26.

(Mark xiv., 3), or he can mean there that the immediate period preceding the pasch was spent by Jesus in particular acts of love, and that at the supper done (not "before the Pasch," but) at "the end" of His life, the washing of the Apostles' feet took place. On Nisan 14, at night when "the first day of the Azymes" had come, was the Last Supper; and during the Nisan 15 Jesus was delivered unto Pilate.

That Jesus was crucified on the same day He had been judged it is not right to say. In fact, it was "the sixth hour" (John xix., 14), i. e., about noon (comp. John iv., 6) and "the parasceve of the pasch" (John xix., 14), i. e., the hour of the effective preparation of the pasch, or Chagighah, when Pilate tried again to save Jesus and did not condemn Him; and Jesus was crucified at "the third hour" (Mark xv., 25), i. e., about 9 o'clock in the morning, and it appears clearly evident that Jesus was crucified on some other day, after He had been judged by Pilate. Also on Nisan 15 Jesus was judged by Caiphas, second by Pilate, third by Herod, and probably on the next day only He was judged again by Pilate, who wanted first to call together "the chief priests and the magistrates and the people" (Luke xxiii., 13), who appear to have retired during the night. Finally the Procurator could hardly send a man to death without the approval of the President of Syria, and probably there were necessary a few days to ask and to receive such an approval. An ancient tradition speaks of three columns venerated as relics because Jesus was fastened to them at different times while in prison; and this suggests that He was confined for a considerable peirod of time in the same or in separate dungeons. Therefore, Jesus did not die on Nisan 15, but on some day afterward, and He could have remained many days in prison until Friday Nisan 20, when He was crucified; then following the great or solemn day of Nisan 21 (Leviticus xxiii., 7, 15), which coincided in that year with Saturday (John xix., 31; comp. John 37): "The Jews . . . that the bodies might not remain upon the Cross on the Sabbath Day (for that was a great Sabbath Day)" . . . i. e., on the next being a Sabbath Day, the bodies could not be removed from the Cross; and because it was a solemn and great feast day, the Jews did not like to see the bodies on the Cross, the spectacle not agreeing with their joyful feelings.

"Tenet ergo vulgus latinorum . . . quod passus fuit VIII. calendarum Aprilis . . . Hoc magistri dicunt omnes, et Augustinus, Hieronymus (?), Beda dant auctoritatem ad hoc. Contra hoc potenter arguitur . . . nam diligenter haec discussi tam per me quam secundum consensum peritorum in astronomia . . . *Quapropter multa secundum scripturam* sunt mihi et multis *insolu-*

bilia in hac parte.[100] This very strong traditional statement that the death of Jesus occurred on March 25 has been confirmed by the hand of God Himself.

There is preserved at Andria (Province of Bari, Italy) one of the holy thorns of the crown of Jesus containing some of His blood, in which a wonderful change takes place whenever Good Friday falls on the 25th of March. This miracle has been carefully examined, analyzed and testified to each time by the most competent commissions, and recently in A. D. 1910.[101]

To conclude with, Jesus died in A. D. 29, on Friday, March 25, Nisan 20, which coincidents exactly agree with astronomy, for in A. D. 29 the first new moon was visible on March 5; consequently the first day of Nisan on Sunday, March 6, etc.

From B. C. 20 to A. D. 29 are counted 47 years and 3 months (49 Jewish years) of the full age of Our Lord.

THE ERRONEOUS CHRONOLOGIES.

The opinion that Jesus died at middle life, that is to say, below forty, or better, at thirty-three, presents no intrinsical evidence at all; on the contrary, it always meets with serious difficulties, apparently to be harmonized with astronomical results and historical accounts. Therefore, we find so many opinions contrasting with each other, as those of Origen, Ps. Cyprian, Eusebius, St. Jerome, Orosius, Lactantius, Beda, Card. Baronio, etc.

The doctrine of the young age of Jesus, attributed to Him, first, the age of thirty years and His death in the year 15 of Tiberius; second, the age of thirty complete years and His death in the year 15 of Tiberius; third, the age of thirty-one years and His death in the year 16 of Tiberius; fourth, the age of thirty-two years and His death in the year 17 of Tiberius; fifth, the age of thirty-three years and His death in the year 18 of Tiberius; sixth, the age of thirty-four years and His death in the year 19 of Tiberius; seventh, the age of thirty-three complete years, and later of thirty-three years and three months, and His death in the year 18 of Tiberius. To the chronology of the young age of Christ we can give the fitting reproach: Because you are false, you change; and because you change, you are false.

The chronology making Our Lord younger might be arranged in the following way: The birth of Jesus in December, B. C. 5; the 15th year of Tiberius (A. D. 11-A. D. 25) and the first preaching of St. John in A. D. 25; the baptism of Jesus in January, A. D.

---

[100] Bacon; Opus Maius IV., 4, 16.

[101] *Cfr.* Marra Monografie Andriesi II., III.; La Civilta' Cattolica, Una delle Maggiore Spine di N. S. G. C. 7, Maggio 1910.

26; the first Passover in the 46th year of the rebuilding of the Temple by Herod (St. John ii., 20), B. C. 20-A. D. 26, the death in A. D. 29. But because in B. C. 5 Cyrenius was not governing Syria, this date is excluded by the Gospel of St. Luke (ii., 2). It is wrong to count the 15th year of Tiberius from A. D. 11, because St. Luke does not say in the 15th year of the administration (which began in those provinces in A. D. 11), but he says in the 15th year of the "Empire" of Tiberius, from A. D. 14. Let us translate "in the 15th year of the reign of Tiberius," and we can only understand of the reign of Tiberius over the Roman Empire, otherwise St. Luke would have written—in the 15th year of the reign of Tiberius over the provinces. We have no right, and it would be offensive to the Evangelist, to think that he is improper in his expressions. That in the Orient they used to count the years of Tiberius from about A. D. 11 was never proved, and is false. It is not only odious, but pernicious to fight against historical evidence.

Until the coming of the fourth century the age of Jesus as thirty-three years appears the first time in St. Hippolytus (in Dan. iv.) and is not genuine, either. The Paschal canon of St. Hippolytus attributes to Jesus either one—the age of 29 years and 3 months (31 Jewish years) or 45 years and 3 months (47 Jewish years), because he refers the Incarnation to the second year and the Passion to the last year of a lunar cycle of sixteen years. When St. Jerome fixed the age of Jesus as 33 years (34 Jewish years or 32 years and 3 months) he tried to confirm it with all the historical and exegetical arguments that were in his power.[102] It does not appear possible that he would have overlooked the best argument of Christian tradition if this could be used to advance his opinion.

St. Jerome never meant to profess a traditional age of Jesus. History, as applying to this subject, had been so confused by the preceding chronologists that St. Jerome was unable to defend the Christian tradition of the nearly old age of Jesus, and not to offend the infallible truthfulness of the Gospel. Thence St. Jerome was forced to argue in his mind that such a tradition could not be genuine, that the true age of Christ was ignored by the faithful and that it was necessary to fix it by doctrine.

However, the opinion of the young age of Jesus is contradictory to the statement of the oldest and greatest fathers, like Irenaeus and Clement Alexandrinus: 'Sunt porro hi testes fide dignissimi, quippe qui rectae semper catholicaeque doctrinae propugnatores exiterint: Irenaeum dico et Clementem Alexandrinum."[103]

The number of thirty-three years as Jesus' age at death is given in ecclesiastical books as the probable conclusion of learned men, not as an authoritative teaching of the Church. In fact, students are freely questioning the chronology of Christ; modern Catholic books and periodicals profess the age of Jesus of 32 years, or 35 or 38 years, and the Church has never interfered. If the opinion that Jesus' age was nearly fifty years has been overlooked for so long a time, it was a fault of the students, but in no way has our Holy Mother Church shown any repugnance to it. Obviously the age of Christ is a matter of faith, and the liberty of discussion allowed to the students on the subject is a proof of the feeling of the Church that the adopted view of the age of Christ is not infallible and its traditional value at least doubtful. The age of Jesus is also an historical question, and because the Church teaches that there cannot be contradiction between faith and history, she was not able to condemn the opinion of the young age of Jesus, since the age of nearly fifty years seemed historically impossible.

---

[102] Chromicon A. C. 33.

[103] Eusebius Hist. Eccl. II., 91.

At first the Valentinians held that Jesus was born in A. U. C. 759,[104] that is, at the time of the only census made by Cyrenius in Judea mentioned by Josephus. With those heretics obtained an historical evidence that gave the lie to the traditional age of the Lord; and they interpreted St. Luke (ii., 1) as referring the whole ministry of Christ to the year 15 of Tiberius. Origen considered the historical proof of the Valentinians true, and in order not to reject the Gospel of St. John, argued that the baptism and the death of the Lord were not included within the year 15 of Tiberius.[105] Shortly after, reflection upon historical facts brought to light that the year 15 of Tiberius fell in the year of Rome 781; to maintain that the year 15 of Tiberius was 788 of A. U. C. it would have been necessary to overturn the whole history of Rome. Hence the belief that Christ died in Nisan in 782, and that He was born at the time of the census in 752 A. U. C.[106]

Then Eusebius compiled his "Chronicon," and holding to the year 15 of Tiberius as 781 of Rome, confirmed the unheard of abuse of anticipating the census of Cyrenius by referring it to the period of Herod, and he attributed it to 751 of Rome; he made Herod die three years later, 753 A. U. C.; he dated the end of Annas' priesthood thirteen years later, A. U. C. 781; he put forward the first year of Caiphas by referring it to 783 A. U. C., and consequently to Nisan A. U. C. 782 he attributed the death of the Redeemer. It was entirely a fantastic chronology. He regarded as true the false evidence that Christ was born at the time of the census of Cyrenius, mentioned by Josephus, which could not be anticipated more than Eusebius had done.

---

[104] Clement Alex. Strom. I., 147, V. supra.

[105] Nisan A. D. 28-Nisan A. D. 29.

[106] Clement Alex.

Christian doctors could not have invented a Cyrenius governor of Syria; they did not know how to find the fact of history that Cyrenius had governed Syria. Once before, therefore, they must do violence to Josephus' story; but violence has a limit, and if they knew how to anticipate the census of Cyrenius by eight years to make it agree with the Gospel, they would not anticipate it by twenty-six years to make it agree with Christian tradition.

Such is the origin of the erroneous chronologies on this subject. When, then, with the passing of years, all memory of primitive interpretations was lost of verse i., c. 3, of St. Luke, the error became more incurable.

The common opinion of the doctors on the young age of Christ cannot deserve better attention than that of the apostolic tradition of the second century. If those doctors were mistaken in their historical conclusions, this can in no way hurt the faith of any sincere believer. That the progress of history vindicates to-day the right of apostolic tradition is only glorious to our faith. The meaning of the above said miracle of Andria and the revelation of Our Lady of Loretto as to the age of Jesus at His flight into Egypt are also deserving of attention. To the authoritative teaching of the Church I do humbly submit my conclusions with entire obedience.

CHRONOLOGY OF OUR LORD AND THE PROPHECY OF DANIEL.

"Seventy weeks are decreed upon thy people," i. e., from the freedom of the Jewish people after the seventy years of the Babylonical exile; "and upon thy holy city," i. e., and again from the rebuilding of Jerusalem shall be counted seventy weeks, "that transgression may be finished and sin may have an end and iniquity may be abolished." The Prophet seems here to refer to the sanctity that will spread among those Jews who will become followers of Christ; "and everalasting justice may be brought" through the death and resurrection of Christ; "and vision and prophecy may be fulfilled" with all the life of Christ;" "and the saint of saints may be anointed" with the Incarnation of the Son of God. Thus the prophecy goes back from the last date to the first one.

'Know thou, therefore, and take notice that from the going forth of the word, to build up Jerusalem again, unto Christ the Prince, there shall be seven weeks and sixty-two weeks; and the street shall be built again, and the wall in straightness of times." The words of Daniel, "and the street shall be built again and the walls in straightness of times," specify the very "word to build up Jerusalem again" by which the streets and the wall shall be built again in a short time (cf. Nehemias vi., 15). From that word are to be counted seven and sixty-two weeks until (the ending of) Christ the Prince.

"And after sixty-two weeks Christ shall be slain; and the people that shall deny Him shall not be His. And a people with their leader that shall come, shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be waste, and after the end of the war the appointed desolation." The prophet, having first related the spiritual benefits brought by Christ, relates now the misfortunes of those who will not follow Him; they will be also rejected by Christ; an evident proof of the anger of God against them will be the destruction of Jerusalem, and after that the appointed desolation.

"And he shall confirm the covenant with many in one week;" if Christ is to be slain after sixty-nine weeks, the confirmation of the covenant after the death of Christ will be performed by His apostles during seven years of their preaching exclusively to the Jews of Palestine; "and in the half of the week the victim and the sacrifice shall fail, and there shall be in the Temple the abomination of desolation, and the desolation shall continue even to the consummation and to the end." By the end we must understand until the next coming of Elias; we know that the Jews are to be converted. Cf. St. Luke xxi., 24: "And Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles, till the times of the nations be fulfilled;" and St. Paul to the Romans xi., 25, 26, 23: "Blindness in part has happened in Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles should come in. And so all Israel should be saved. . . . For God is able to graft them in again."

I cannot take into consideration here all the objections that are made to the Book of Daniel. For my purpose it will be sufficient to note here that the third year of Joachim ended about March, B. C. 604, while the first year of Nabuchodonosor ended, perhaps, about July, B. C. 604, and so both the third and the fourth year of Joachim coincided with the first of Nabuchodonosor (cf. Daniel i., 1; Jeremias xxv., 1).

In the first verse of chapter ix. the vision of Daniel is said to take place in the first year of Darius the Mede. That verse does not agree with any of the other identical passages in the Book of Daniel. This prophet notes a date always in a most simple manner and never repeats it: "In the first year of . . . in the first year of his reign" (cf. i., 1; ii., 1; vii., 1; viii., 1; x., 1). This is an argument for doubting of the authenticity of that verse. Moreover, only in a later period, when many Dariuses had been kings of Babylon, was the verse i. of chapter ix. possible, which evidently is ordained to distinguish the Darius of Daniel from the others.

This vision of Daniel in chapter ix. is not in the proper place. In fact, it is extraneous to the preceding vision of the Empire of Alexander (ch. viii.) and extraneous to the vision following there of the Persian Empire (ch. xi). At the beginning of chapter xii., which says of the end of the world, the expression "at that time" must be referred to the ending of chapter ix.: "And the desolation will endure until the consummation, until the end" (ix., 27): "At that time, etc." (xii., 1). The verse 20 of chapter ix. appears to be an interpolation and so also a portion of verse 21. There is a repetition unusual to the prophet: "Now, while I was yet speaking and praying . . . as I was yet speaking in prayer" (ix., 20, 21). In this verse 21 the prophet says: "Behold the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the beginning, flying swiftly, touched me, etc." These words cannot be referred to the first vision of Daniel (ch. vii.), because Gabriel there does not appear; neither can they be referred to the second vision of Daniel, as in such an interpretation Gabriel in no way had been seen in the vision "at the beginning;" it remains to refer the same expression to the beginning of the actual vision of Daniel, arguing that verse 21 and sqq. of chapter ix. is a continuation of chapter x. All that is said in chapter x. shows the very peculiar importance of the following vision of seventy weeks and of the end.

The chronological order of the visions of Daniel can be arranged in the following way: The first vision in the first year of Baltassar (vii.); the second vision in the third year of Baltassar (viii.); the third vision in the first year of Cyrus (xi.); the cries of Daniel, who was counting seventy years from the third year of Joachim, in the second year of Cyrus (ix., 2, 19); the fourth vision in the third year of Cyrus (x., ix., 21, 27; xii).

Modernists of every degree should feel ashamed of adopting the view of Porphyre in this prophecy's interpretation. To say (as they assume) that Daniel changes seventy years into seventy weeks is an abuse of the worst kind;[107] the prophecy of Jeremiah cannot be taken as the *terminus a quo* of the seventy weeks of Daniel, not only because of the good reasons given by Rev. Pusey,[108] but also because of the words of Daniel himself, "seventy weeks are decreed . . . upon thy holy city," (ix.) that meaning from the time the city will exist again by being rebuilt.

Finally some mistakes in Josephus can easily be corrected by Josephus himself, and this reveals that his dates are not always genuine. But apart from this, to argue that Daniel had mistaken his number of years in his one chronological account, because Josephus also in his immense work has made some foolish mistakes, this is something different from criticism.

---

[107] *Cf.* Pusey, Daniel the Prophet.

[108] *Loc. cit.*

Now let us consider the period of time represented by one and by seventy "weeks." (Daniel ix., 24.)

The Greeks, as we know, were accustomed to grouping years in Olympiads, computing four years in each Olympiad. The Hebrews after Moses in a like manner summed their years in "weeks," allowing seven years to each "week." Six of these years were those of labor, and during them the Hebrews were permitted to work; but throughout the entire seventh year all work was forbidden. This seventh was termed the sabbatical year, or the year of the resting of the Lord. (Leviticus xxv.)

The Hebrews were commanded, moreover, to number seven weeks of years; that is to say, to enumerate seven times seven or forty-nine years. Then they were to sanctify the fiftieth as the year of jubilee, in which every man who had sold his home or his field was to regain its possession; every servant should become free; and, as in the sabbatical year, every one and everything should have rest.[109] "Ego Daniel, in Danielis hebdom. supputatione, non possum non notare in aliis, quod post septem, quasque septimanas, annum 50 seu Jubilaeum omittant, contra expressum in Mose Mandatum."[110]

The majority of the rabbis hold that the jubilee year was an intercalation and followed the seventh sabbatical year, making two fallow years in succession. After both had passed, the next cycle began. . . . Judah Ha-Nasa, however, contends that the Jubilee was identical with the seventh sabbatical year. The opinion of the Geonim and of later authorities generally prevails, that the Jubilee when in force during the period of the First Temple was intercalated; but that in the time of the Second Temple, when the Jubilee was observed only nominally, it coincides with the seventh sabbatical year."[111]

In the Holy Bible the year B. C. 700 is called the first year; B. C. 699 the second year and B. C. 698 the third year (of the week: Isaiah xxxvii., 30). A sabbatical year began in October, B. C. 588 in the 10th year of Zedekiah, while on June, B. C. 597, the first year of Zedekiah coincided with the 4th year of the week (Jeremiah xxviii., 1; xxxiv., 8, 13). The twentieth year of Artaxerxes (i. e., Xerxes), according to Nehemias, was a Jubilee year, B. C. 465. Finally, the year of the Greeks 150 in I. Macchabees vi., 53, is called the year seventh; and there is meant B. C. 151, counting 150 years from the first year of the Greeks in Judea, B. C. 300. So from the first year of Jonathan and 152 of the Greeks (I. Macchabees ix., 3, 31, 54) Josephus counted years 82 and 32=113 years until the first year of Herod: B. C. 149+113=B. C. 37 (consequently he had counted not 125, but 115 years from B. C. 151 to B. C. 37). Lucius, Consul, wrote his letter to the Jews (I. Macchabees xv., 10, 15) in the year of the Greeks 173-174, B. C. 128-B. C. 127.

---

[110] Daniel Angelocratora. *Cf.* B. D. Matthiae Wasmuthi Hebraismus Facilitati et Integritati suae Restitutus.

[109] *Ibid.*

[111] Jewish Encyclopedia, Sabbatical Year and Jubilee, Fifty and Forty-nine Year Cycle.

During the 430 years between B. C. 1016 and B. C. 587 are counted seventy sabbatical years (Lev. xxvi., 34; Ezechiel iv., 5, 6), because a last seventh year occurred in the year 11th of Sedecias, B. C. 587; a first seventh year in B. C. 1016; a first Jubilee year in B. C. 1015, altogether three sabbatical years; the remaining 427 years include 8 jubilee and 59 seventh years; 59+8+3=70 sabbatical years. In every way the Bible testifies 50 years for every period of seven weeks.

Therefore, according to Holy Scripture and hence by the law of God, as well as in the practice of the Hebrews, seven "weeks" signify 7×7=49 years, plus one year extra for the Jubilees=50 years; the term seven "weeks" indicates, therefore, a cycle of fifty years. 7 weeks=1 cycle of 50 years; 70 weeks=10 cycles of 50 years; 10×50=500 years; or we may say that 70 weeks equal 70×7=490 years, plus 10 additional years for 10 Jubilees occurring in 70 weeks, this aggregating 500 years. Finally 62 weeks means 9 cycles of 50 years, 50×9=450 years, less one "week" of 7 years =443 years (Cfr. Daniel ix., 24-27).

Now, there are counted 70 years from the 9th, 10th and 11th of Sedecias, B. C. 589-B. C. 587 to the year of Darius 1st, 2d, 3d and 4th; Nisan, B. C. 520-Nisan B. C. 517, exclusive (cf. Zaccarias i., 12; vii., 1, 5); and 70 weeks or 500 years are counted "upon the (Jewish) people," i. e., from the freedom of the Jewish people in B. C. 520-B. C. 518 to B. C. 21-B. C. 19, date of the birth of Our Redeemer.

It is now necessary to establish the date of the Decree to rebuild Jerusalem, which is mentioned in the Book of Nehemias.

Therein it is stated that in the month Nisan of the twentieth year of Artaxerxes the King, Nehemias, spoke to the King, saying: "The city of the place of the sepulchre of my fathers is desolate, and the gates thereof are burnt with fire . . . send me into Judea, to the city of the sepulchre of my father and I will build it. . . . And it pleased the king and he sent me."

The date of the Decree to build Jerusalem is the month Nisan of the twentieth year of Artaxerxes. But who is this Artaxerxes?

Jewish tradition testifies that the Artaxerxes of Nehemias is Xerxes. The very authoritative translation of the seventy of the Book of Nehemias has expressly "in the twentieth year of Xerxes" (Nehemias ii., 1). Josephus Flavius, the greatest of Jewish historians, whom St. Jerome called a miracle of erudition of profane history, refers the decree of rebuilding Jerusalem to Xerxes. The lists of the kings of Persia in the Jewish commentaries on Esdras show the same sentence, "Ibn. Ezra gives five: 1. Darius the Mede; 2. Cyrus the Persian; 3. Ahasuerus, Artaxerxes the First; 4. Darius the Persian, son of Esther; 5. Artaxerxes. Moses ha-Koehn, ha-Sefardi (In Ibn. Ezra) makes six kings; 1. Darius the Elder or the Mede; 2. Cyrus the Persian; 3. Ahasuerus; 4. Artaxerxes; 5. Darius the Persian; 6. Artaxerxes the Rich."[112] In these lists the name Artaxerxes is given to Cambyses and to the successor of Darius Hystaspes, that is to Xerxes.

It would be difficult, indeed, to believe that Xerxes throughout his prolonged reign did nothing either in behalf of or against the Jews, so that he would not be mentioned in the Bible at all; while it is certain that during his supremacy the Jews tried to rebuild their capital city, and that their enemies tried to prevent the accomplishment of their purposes. Even Xerxes, who had waged war against the Greeks and had suffered violent revolutions also, must have observed the manifest political advantage of gratifying the Jewish people. Now, in the Holy Bible, Xerxes only can be identified with Artaxerxes of the Book of Nehemias and of I. Esdras (vii., 1, 7).

"Themistocles is said to have taken refuge with Artaxerxes;[113] . . . Ephorus; Dinon, Clitarchus, and Heraclides, of whom all maintain that Themistocles fled to Xerxes. . . . Now, the flight of Themistocles to the Persian Court is placed before the year 470 B. C. by such authors as Cicero (Lael. xii.), Diodorus Siculus (xi., 35), Eusebius,[114] Thucidides (i., 136)."[115] Consequently, the flight of Themistocles to the Persian Court must be placed before the death of Xerxes, and from the error of Thucidides we are justified in deducing that Xerxes was named also Artaxerxes in the historical documents. "Historici subinde confundant nomina haec Xerxes at Artaxerxes, quasi sit unum idemque."[116] Says Ctesias

---

[112] Anecdota Oxoniensia, etc., edited by H. J. Matheus, M. A., Oxford, 1882.

[113] *Cfr.* Thucidides I.: 132; Plutarch, 27; Cornelius Nepos, Suidas and the Scholias of Aristophanes.

[114] Chronicon Armen.

[115] Christ in Type and Prophecy, by Rev. A. J. Maas, S. J., C. II., Sec. II., Corollaries.

[116] Cornelius a Lapide Comm. in Dan., C. IX.

(Persika): "Achaemenidem fratrem in Aegyptum mittit . . . ad Artaxerxem proficiscitur, quem invenit Inaro vehementar iratum, quod is Achaemenidem regis fratrem interfecerat." Now, Achaemenides, not to Artaxerxes Longimanus, but to Xerxes was really brother; and it appears again that the name of Artaxerxes referred to Xerxes in historical documents let Ctesias refer to Artaxerxes Longimanus events that should be referred to Xerxes. Even the name of Longimanus belonged perhaps to Xerxes: "Longimanus-Sic dictus Darius Hystaspes, secundum Polycletum, vel Xerxes, secundum Antileontem, vel Ochus cognomento Artaxerxes."[117] Such identity of names can have caused the mistake of attributing to Xerxes 12 or 21 or 22 years, instead of 31 or 32.

Xerxes began to reign between July B. C. 485-July B. C. 484: According to Herodotus, after the rebellion of Egypt, Xerxes spent four entire years (that is, until the close of the fourth year) in preparing his armies; and at the close of the fifth (of the reign of Xerxes from the death of Darius, which was the close of the fourth year from the rebellion of Egypt) he started out against the Greeks. Herodotus counted five years from the battle of Marathon to the death of Darius (B. C. 488-B. C. 484), six years from the death of Darius to the exit of Xerxes from Sardis (B. C. 484-B. C. 479), altogether ten years according to all authors (B. C. 488-B. C. 479).

The exit of Xerxes from Sardis in B. C. 479 is marked by an eclipse noted by Herodotus and calculated by Keppler (Chronologia Graeca). Eratosthenes, too, had counted "a prima alympiade usque ad Xerxis transitum anni 297; inde ad initium belli peloponnisiaci anni 48;"[118] i. e., 297 years are counted from B. C. 776-75 to B. C. 480-79; and 48 years from B. C. 480-79 to June, B. C. 342. August, B. C. 432, the first year of the 87th 01, was the historical eclipse calculated by Keppler.[119] If the Passover, B. C. 479, belongs to the 6th year of Xerxes, the decree of rebuilding Jerusalem in the Passover of the 20th year of Xerxes fell on B. C. 465.

B. C. 465+7 weeks, i. e., 50 years=B. C. 465;

B. C. 415+62 weeks, i. e., 443 years=A. D. 28.

Then one more week is counted from A. D. 29 to A. D. 35, and the middle of the "week" would be A. D. 32.

So, according to the prophecy of Daniel, from the first, second, third and fourth year of Darius to Jesus Christ 70 weeks must elapse; from the decree of Xerxes to the end of Christ's ministry, 7 weeks+62 weeks. During another week God's promise to the

---

[117] Pollux II., 4, 151; *cf.* Mullerus, Vol. IV., p. 306.

[118] Fragmenta Chronologica; *cf.* Mullerus, Vol. XXIII.

[119] *Loc. cit.*

Hebrews must be fulfilled; in the middle of this same week the religious rites of the Jews shall be abolished. Forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem (which could be counted from A. D. 31 to A. D. 70) there happened, in fact, at Jerusalem a remarkable event. From this year there ceased forever a beautiful miracle that heretofore had occurred in Jerusalem in the most public way on the feast day of Tishri 15th, by which miracle a tongue made of bright material continually changed color during that day and became white in order to signify on the part of God the remission of sins. In that same year certain other similar events followed.[120]

So far I hope the wonderful prophecy of Daniel is going to vindicate itself for the glory of God and the sake of men.

History testifies to the birth of Christ at the time of the first census taken in Judea in the administration of Cyrenius in B. C. 20; the preaching of John under the high priesthood of Annas, which began A. D. 6; astronomy shows that the death of the Redeemer on Friday, March 25, occurred in A. D. 29.

The prophecy of Aggeus and that of Daniel testify to the birth of Christ in the same year, B. C. 20; the prophecy of Moses foretells the manifestation of the Messiah (with the previous Annunciation of his Precursor) to the total overthrow of the civil power in Judea, which happened A. D. 6; Daniel foretells that 69 weeks of years will elapse to A. D. 28; indicating the death of the Lord some time at the beginning of the following year, 29 A. D.

The tradition of the year of the birth of the Saviour referred to the lunar cycle, and has not come down to us. Tertullian and a Synod of ninety Bishops referred the birth of Jesus to some time after the year 44 B. C. Others indirectly made the birth of Jesus coincide with the beginning of the rebuilding of the Temple, in the year B. C. 20. A letter of Lentulus and St. Justin supposes the baptism of Christ as occurring prior to Pontius Pilate, A. D. 24, and St. Melito, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian and Anonymous, and in some way Lactantius, testify to its occurring prior to the death of Augustus, A. D. 14.

Apostolic tradition has fixed the death of the Lord as occurring at about his fiftieth year.

In order to successfully combat the boasting incredulity of our day, we cannot hold against historical evidence an erroneous chronology which is so intimately connected with the infallibility of Holy Writ; but we must make use of the historical and astronomical evidence which Divine Providence puts in our hands to show the truth of the Gospel, of prophecy and of Christian tradition. Mary the Virgin, ever the holy guide of Christians, in a revelation accredited to her and connected with the miracle of the translation of the Holy House of Loretto, by her having told us that Jesus fled into Egypt after the age of twelve (and necessarily before the death of Herod, B. C. 4) has suggested that at his death Christ was more than forty-three years old.

---

[120] G. Jona VI., 3; Juchasim f. 10 and f. 15; Rosh Haxhama f. 31; R. Solomon XI., 1.

May God, through the Sacred Heart of Jesus, give us the best knowledge of the truth.

FRANCIS VALITUTTI, O. F. M.

Mount Vernon, N. Y.

MARIA EINSIEDELN.

ALTHOUGH not well known to the majority of Catholics in our land, the shrine of Our Lady of the Hermits is, after Lourdes, one of the best known and most celebrated on the Continent. Each year enormous numbers of pilgrims visit this sanctuary. In 1861, the jubilee year (one thousand years since the death of St. Meinrad), the number reached more than two hundred thousand, and the ordinary yearly average is between a hundred and sixty and a hundred and seventy thousand.

Many saints have been pilgrims here; among others, St. Charles Borromeo, St. Nicholas of Flue and Blessed Benedict Joseph Labre, the poor man of the Forty Hours, were devout clients of Our Lady of Einsiedeln. The pilgrimages come chiefly from all parts of Switzerland, the Black Forest, Bavaria, Wurtemburg, France, Italy, Austria and Hungary, and although no English *pilgrimage* has yet found its way here, yet English pilgrims are not uncommon, and let us hope the day is not far distant when Our Lady's Dowry shall send a band of pilgrims to offer her their homage at this famous shrine.

Only a very small percentage of the pilgrims come in any hope of receiving temporal favors. True it is that many miracles are worked here, through Our Lady's intercession; but by far the greater number of these are spiritual. They come to pray for graces, they come as an outward expression of their love and reverence and to obtain the blessing of the dear "Muttergottes" on their daily toil and for their humble homes.

Einsiedeln lies on a large fertile plateau, surrounded by hills, half-way between Zürich and Lucerne. The large, compact village, composed chiefly of hotels and "gasthofen" and shops containing a vast selection of rosaries, medals and endless objects of piety, is separated from the church by a large open space, paved with cobbles, in the centre of which is the fountain. The purest water pours from fourteen jets, and is carried away by underground channels to the neighboring River Sihl. The fountain is a very fine one, with a bronze statue of the Immaculate Conception, and above, a crown, upheld by marble pillars. Pilgrims seldom leave Einsiedeln without first solemnly walking round it, drinking from each jet as they go. This extraordinary custom arises from a tradition that Our Lord Himself drank from one of the jets. No one knows which, so the pilgrims drink from each in turn. Needless to say, this practice is not encouraged by the authorities, but it lives and flourishes as such ideas will. As the peasant believes that once having drunk from the hallowed water jet he will unfailingly return to Einsiedeln, and this being the summit of his ambition, the practice is not likely to die out. A large semi-circle of granite steps leads to the upper portion of the open space, or "Platz," and here, slightly raised above the village, at the foot of the sheltering, dark-green, fir-clad hills, lies the monastery, with the huge church in the middle. Two towers rise from the basilica bearing double crosses on each, showing that Einsiedeln is exempt from the jurisdiction of the Bishop.

The monastery dates back through more than ten centuries. St. Meinrad, the first hermit (hence the name Einsiedeln, or Hermits), was sent when very young by his father, Prince Berthold of Hohenzollern, to the monastery of Reichnau, near Constance, to be educated. His uncle, afterwards abbot of that monastery, much struck by the boy's abilities, fostered his growing vocation, and in the year A. D. 822 Meinrad took the habit of St. Benedict. For some time he was a professor at Benken, but later, with his superior's consent, he retired to the Etzel, a hill overlooking the Lake of Zürich, and there, in a tiny cell, built for him by a pious woman from a neighboring village, he dwelt for seven years. But his solitude was constantly invaded by all kinds of people, for the rumors of his singular holiness drew many to his cell, to consult him in their difficulties and to beg his prayers. So he withdrew deeper into the forest, which then covered the fertile plain on which Einsiedeln stands. It was called the "Dark Forest," owing to the fact that it was composed entirely of fir trees.

Here he built his hermitage, a tiny cell, and an oratory containing an altar and a wooden statue of the Mother of God. And to-day the statue before which he prayed, after the lapse of more than a thousand years, is still to be seen on the same spot, for the Holy Chapel of Einsiedeln is built on the exact site of St. Meinrad's oratory. For twenty-six years the holy hermit inhabited his forest cell, until in A. D. 861 he was murdered by two thieves, who believed him to be the possessor of hidden treasures. They searched in vain, and finding nothing but his chalice and the wooden statue, they fled to Zürich. The story goes that two ravens St. Meinrad had fed all through the winter followed them, flying screaming round their heads and trying to tear out their eyes with their beaks and claws. Do what they would, the men could not rid themselves of the two furious birds, which pursued them into the town. The suspicions of the magistrates were aroused by this extraordinary spectacle, and the assassins were arrested. They confessed their guilt and were executed.

It is in memory of this event that the monastery arms bear on them two ravens. The monks of Reichnau hastened to St. Meinrad's cell and carried the blessed relics to Reichnau for interment, but his heart they buried on the Etzel, near his former hermitage.

In 1039 his remains were brought back to Einsiedeln, where they have reposed ever since. The skull, on which the dents caused by the bludgeons of his murderers can yet be seen, is kept in a small tabernacle in the Holy Chapel, at the feet of the image of the Blessed Mother, which he so loved and venerated in life.* St. Meinrad's hermitage was not deserted. Some of his brethren among the monks of Reichnau, in imitation of him, built themselves huts in the Dark Forest around his oratory, and by degrees, as more and more monks congregated there, a monastery and a large church gradually arose. They were finally completed in 947 under the direction of the Abbot Eberhard.

Every precaution was taken to interfere in no way with St. Meinrad's oratory. The church was built round it, and it remained, untouched, in the nave of the larger building. In 948 St. Eberhard invited Conrad, Bishop of Constance, to consecrate Our Lady's Shrine. The ceremony was to take place on the feast of the Exaltation of Holy Cross (September 14). On the eve of the feast Conrad, accompanied by St. Ulric, Bishop of Augsbourg, the Emperor Otho the Great and St. Adelaide, his wife, and a vast concourse of nobility and clergy arrived to perform the ceremony of consecration. During the night the holy Bishop rose to join with the monks in their midnight office. All present heard the songs of angelic choirs encircling the chapel and heard also the words of the Mass of dedication.

The following day the assistants were waiting, and all was ready for the ceremony, but the Bishop did not appear. At last, weary of waiting, they went to fetch him, but he refused to consecrate the chapel, saying it was already done. The whole company at once began to argue with him and entreated him to commence. At last, persuaded by their earnestness, he consented to begin. He had hardly done so when a loud, clear voice exclaimed, "Cease, brother; the chapel is already consecrated by God Himself." The entire concourse of people, hearing the voice, recognized and confessed that the Bishop was right, and never again has any one attempted to consecrate the Holy Chapel. Our Lord Himself had deigned to bless His Mother's Shrine, and that sufficed. This miraculous dedication is commemorated yearly on September 14. Solemn High Mass is sung in the Holy Chapel in the presence of thousands of pilgrims, and at Einsiedeln that feast (die Engelweihe) is one of the greatest of the whole year.

---

* See "Description de l'Abbaye et du Pèlerinage de Notre Dame-des-Ermites," Benziger et Cie, Einsiedeln-Suisse.

The present enormous church, built in Carocco style, was completed in 1735. Four times have the church and monastery been burned to the ground. The first and second time the Holy Chapel, though built only of wood, escaped, but the third time (1465) it was also consumed by the flames. Rebuilt with stone pillars and an arched roof, it remained until 1617, when the stone pillars were removed and replaced by marble walls.

The basilica itself measures about 370 feet long and 135 feet wide. In it there are fourteen altars, not counting those in the monks' choir, the sanctuary, the penitentiary, or the Holy Chapel—seven on each side of the nave. The first on the left, as one enters the church, is the Rosary Altar, where the parish, or "Rosary Mass," is said, at 6 o'clock on week-days and an hour later on Sundays and holy days. The Rosary is said aloud during that Mass, and it is the one chiefly attended by the inhabitants of Einsiedeln. This, too, is the Communion altar, for though it is shut off from the nave, as are all the others, by magnificent wrought iron grills fifteen feet high, the door in the centre is always open, and on this side of the grill are marble altar rails, at which at least thirty-eight or forty people can kneel together. Every half-hour from 4 A. M. to 10 A. M. Holy Communion is given. At the time of the larger pilgrimages the crowd of communicants is so great that one often has to wait an hour or more for one's turn, and this when two priests are distributing Holy Communion. The next chapel is that of St. Joseph. Here the weddings take place. Hundreds of couples come from all over Switzerland and the neighboring countries. The civil contract is completed in their own parishes, but for the Church's blessing on their union they come in numbers to this mountain sanctuary. All through the summer months it is nothing uncommon to see six or seven couples in St. Joseph's chapel—the brides in the quaintest costumes, with or without veils as their fancy dictates, very quiet and self-possessed; the grooms very shy and being positively led to the altar by their respective brides. One article of dress appears to be "de rigueur"—for the brides a large wreath, and for the men a still larger buttonhole of artificial orange blossoms.

No couple is ever seen without this ornament, however soberly they may otherwise be dressed or however elderly they may be!

Further on comes the large chapel of St. Meinrad, and on each side of the centre altar are the two smaller ones, the Sacred Heart on the left and the Most Pure Heart of Mary on the right. Then the chapel of St. Maurice, patron of the basilica, with a marble statue to the right of St. Anthony of Padua. Beyond this are the massive double doors leading to the penitentiary. This is of itself a fair-sized church, capable of holding fifteen hundred people and more. Around the walls are thirty-four confessionals, and at the far end an altar, with a beautiful painting above it of St. Mary Magdalen. It represents the saint in the desert, and is one of the finest paintings in the church. There are no benches here, no chairs, nothing but the confessionals on a slightly raised wooden platform, running round the walls. The rest is bare concrete, on which one may stand or kneel when there is room. During the bigger pilgrimages the latter is frequently impossible. The monks can scarcely force their way through the tightly packed crowd to their confessionals. The penitentiary is open (during pilgrimages) from 4 P. M. to 9.30 P. M., and in the morning from 4 o'clock until 10 or 11. Pilgrims who wait from 4 o'clock until the church is shut at night are often unable to make their confession, and return undaunted before 4 the next morning, prepared to wait another three or four hours. The arched roof rests on marble pillars, and is fairly low for the size of the building. It is covered with paintings representing scenes from the lives of penitent saints and Biblical scenes portraying the mercy or the judgments of Almighty God. Thus, Adam and Eve thrust from the garden by an angel with a flaming sword, the Deluge, the return of the prodigal son, St. Peter weeping, the conversion of St. Paul, etc., etc.—in all, sixteen or seventeen pictures, so arranged on the many arches of the roof that from any position one's eye catches sight of one or other of these graphically portrayed and salutary lessons.

Leaving the penitentiary by the same door, one sees at the east end of the church, below the sanctuary, the altar of Holy Cross and on the opposite side the companion altar, with a bas-relief of Our Lord's prayer in the Garden. The sanctuary, well raised above the body of the church, is screened off by three splendid wrought iron doors, opened for High Mass, processions, etc. The picture of the Assumption behind the high altar was restored in 1860 by Paul Deschwanden. Another door, facing the penitentiary, leads into the monastery, and then comes the chapel of St. Sigismund, where every day at 7 and 11 o'clock in the morning and at 4 o'clock in the afternoon all rosaries, medals, statues, etc., are blessed and indulgenced. Then another large chapel opposite St. Meinrad's, and like it also containing three altars, St. Benedict in the middle and St. Conrad and St. Henry left and right. Past the chapel of St. Ann, the mother of Our Lady, affectionately termed "Grossmutter Anna" (grandmother), and we come to the last, the chapel of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, a title very dear to all Einsiedeln folk, as resembling that of Our Lady of the Hermits. Between this altar and the Rosary altar, in the centre of the nave, stands the "gnadenkapelle," or chapel of blessings or graces. Built of black and gray marble, with wrought iron gates almost the whole width of the front and smaller doors, which are those used except on very great feasts in the north and south sides, the "gnadenkapelle" stands facing the entrance of the church, about sixty feet from the doors. Our Lady seems to wait with sweet and patient courtesy the coming of the crowds of pilgrims, as if she would fain be the first to welcome them to her sanctuary.

During the French Revolution the church and monastery were pillaged and the Holy Chapel entirely destroyed. The monks escaped bearing with them the miraculous statue. For a while it was buried at the foot of a neighboring hill and then taken to St. Gérold, where the monks had taken refuge. Finally it was brought back to Einsiedeln in 1803 (September 29). The Holy Chapel was rebuilt, as far as possible, with the old materials, and one may see the cracks in the walls where the fury of the revolutionaries and their hatred of religion vented itself in tearing down and smashing the great slabs of marble. Its present measurements are the same as those of the previous chapel, about 23 feet long and 20 feet wide.

The front of the little edifice was ornamented until three years ago by three quaint old marble bas-reliefs, representing the Birth, Annunciation and Death of the Blessed Virgin. In 1910 the entire church was redecorated, and these bas-reliefs replaced by others in gilded bronze, the Annunciation, the Birth of Christ and the Coronation of Our Lady. Many people, the writer among them, regret the quaint old marble ones, which may now be seen above the big entrance door of the monastery. Still, one must admit there can be no question as to the superiority of the new ones from an artistic point of view.

Above, on the roof of the chapel, stand figures of saints and cherubim, and just above the large door are two adoring angels, bending towards the image of their Queen and beckoning to the faithful to join with them in songs of love and praise. Inside, the altar stands in an arched recess, and on it is a richly jeweled tabernacle, containing the skull of St. Meinrad. Above, surrounded by clouds of gilded brass, one sees the famous statue of Maria Einsiedeln. Alas! before the days of the French Revolution the clouds surrounding her were of gold, the brass bas-relief in front of her altar, representing the miraculous dedication of her shrine, was of silver! Now three brass lamps hang in front of her, instead of the five silver ones of former days!

She is sometimes called the "Black Madonna," for the statue is carved out of oak, darkened by time. She holds the Holy Child on her left arm, and in her right hand is a golden sceptre. Both figures are crowned, and the effect of the whole is somewhat stiff and rigid, as she is always draped in a perfectly straight robe and a veil also in a severely straight line. One of her most beautiful dresses, worn at Pentecost, is of red velvet gorgeously embroidered in gold. It was given by a poor servant girl, who collected the money from people as poor as herself, walking many weary miles in order to collect enough to purchase something that should be worthy of Our Lady's acceptance. But the faces, although so dark a color, are singularly beautiful. The Madonna's is one of great kindness and benignity. She looks down on her clients with a tenderness very difficult to describe. Her loving expression moves all hearts to devotion.

The two special prayers to which all Einsiedeln lovers are particularly attached are the Rosary and the Salve Regina. Every day after Vespers the latter is solemnly sung in the Holy Chapel. The candles are lighted on her altar, and the choir boys and monks advance in procession, enter the chapel and, kneeling, chant the antiphon. The versicle and response and the prayer are proper to the season, but the Salve Regina never changes and is always sung to the same sweet and solemn chant. This act of homage completed, the procession slowly retraces its steps and disappears into the monastery.

May is, as it should be, the favorite month for pilgrimages, and every evening one may hear the Rosary said in a way that inspires one and makes the repetition of the sacred mysteries ever after a new and wonderful prayer. No hurried mechanical effort here, but shouted from hundreds of lips, a full and satisfying devotion. Ten times in every decade, in each Ave after the Holy Name of Jesus, we remind ourselves of the mystery on which we meditate. Take the sorrowful mysteries. Ten times we say the tender words (and German is a language well calculated to express tenderness), "who for us did sweat blood," "who for us was scourged," "who for us was crowned with thorns," "who for us did bear the heavy cross," "who for us was crucified." The worshipers kneel on the floor, with clasped hands upraised to the dear "Muttergottes," and she smiles down on them. Many things I thank her for, but among the many lessons she has taught, the many graces she has given, none more dear than the loving way she has impressed for ever on my mind the beauty of her Rosary. Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners now and at the hour of our death. Amen.

THE GREEN BIBLE.

"THERE are two books from whence I collect my divinity," said old Sir Thomas Browne (1605-1682), "besides the written one of God, another of His servant Nature, that universal and public MS. that lies exposed under the eyes of all. Those that never saw Him in the one have discovered Him in the other. This was the Scripture and theology of the heathens. And surely they knew better how to join and read these mystical letters than we Christians who cast a more careless eye on these common hieroglyphics and disdain to suck divinity from the flowers of nature." The old author of the "Religio Medici" knew well that there is nothing more calculated to bring the mind to a reverent and tranquil state than this study, for the facts of the universe are the results of God's thought, and "God's thoughts," the Psalmist tells us, "are very deep." We are all of us apt to speak of Nature as distinct from the Great Creator, forgetting the truth which an old writer prettily phrases, that "Nature was God's apprentice, to learn in the first seven days, and now His foreman, and works next under Him." I think it is Lafcadio Hearn who says somewhere that the subtlety of Nature is not only proved by sympathies and antipathies, the likes and dislikes of plants, but also by the mysterious influences that make a garden almost magical in its effects upon our hearts. It is not peaceful beauty only that soothes us, but some deeper, diviner thing. There is ever some spiritual seed being sown silently and unseen eventually to bring forth flowers without our foresight or labor. Life in the country is more easily the handmaid of religion than life in a town, just as days spent in natural surroundings are healthier to the body than those among the moiling crowds of our streets. If the saying "God made the country and man the town" be an exaggerated form of truth, still to most men of finer feeling and probably to all good women the relation is that of poetry to prose. Perhaps it is best to be born and bred in the country and for town to be the battlefield of life, so that all our early and lasting associations may be rural, to have those vibrating chords of memory which come with such words as home, mother, father or childhood's days, carrying the mind back instinctively to woods and meadows and country retreats.

The close communion between earth and heaven felt by the pious peasantry of lands like Ireland, Spain or the Tyrol sheds a singular sweetness upon the lonely labor in field or forest; these realize a sense of heavenly companionship only possible to the Catholic husbandman, for the world that is Protestant has lost its youth, and its atmosphere is little favorable to saints and angels. To the

Catholic peasant, as to his mediæval ancestor, the Mary Mass is the opening of his day, and its Gabriel bell that which arouses him from sleep. God, the Virgin Mother and the saints are ever readily present to his thoughts in the manifold sights and sounds of earth. In the temple of the dawn, where we of crowded towns or fevered hours of pleasure are now infrequent worshipers, the peasant is the worshiper; there he offers up his hopes and fears for rain or sunshine, there he listens to anthems of birds we rarely hear, and interprets auguries which for us have little meaning. Upon him, as upon all who thus dedicate the early moments of the new day, the mysterious influences of the dawn exercise an elevating and beneficial control, leading him to connect things sacred with his toil. What we have in all ranks lost of contentment of life and enjoyment of days by forsaking the old methods of thought and existence can only be measured by the contrast between simplicity and artificiality, hope and dull fatalism, joyousness and depression, culture and brutality. Perhaps nothing since the Reformation has been so destructive of social happiness in such lands as England as the tendency to flock to towns and live in the vitiated atmosphere and artificial surroundings of large cities; the modern panacea to brighten and raise the life of these modern lazar-houses of woe is thought to lie in education, and if this showed any chance of bringing men's minds to recognize the virtue of simple life in the country, there might be some hope of its proving beneficial, but since the real motive and object is to raise the commercial ability of the people in competition with other nations, it can have little effect on the happiness of the lives of the individuals themselves or upon social regeneration. "Back to the land," "The land for the people," those old political cries of reformers, are, we believe, the really true and effective ones for the solution of this problem of huge cities. The laborer has been attracted to exchange his dinner of herbs for Apples of Sodom; for himself and his children he has bartered the open life in the fields for the alley, the factory and the degradation and slavery of such existence; the country cottage has been left for a tenement in close courts, the girls have gone to the mill instead of the dairy farm or squire's house; they are clothed in filthy clouts or meretricious cast-off finery in place of simple print and sunbonnet; the whole family has lost its roots, its traditions and become lowered in every member of it; in physical structure, self-respect and old-fashioned ways of homely pride and thought, soul and body are ruined by the exchange, and even if the lower faculties of the mind have been enlarged, its higher ones are lost and the heart becomes brutalized and joyless.

In this study of ours, however, we leave aside these social questions and transport our minds away from the fevered lives of the day to the quiet of older times as to some cloistered enclosure and try to gain some of the peace and happiness that keen appreciation of the world of nature affords when united to a lively faith in its Creator. Then it becomes the very poetry of life, and it is not strange that it awes, woos and charms us, for all beauty is but the sacramental veil of its Divine Author. As Professor Mozley remarks, "Beauty stands upon the threshold of the mystical world and excites a curiosity about God," so the beauty of nature and art can only be fully appreciated and appropriated by those who listen to the voice of the Interpreter of it all and ask Him questions. The magic glories of sunrise and sunset, the inspiration of wide landscape, the breathless silence broken by the song of birds, the wind among the trees, the sounds of the animal and insect life, silence palpitating with life, the serenity of the star-strewn depths of space, the herding of waves upon the shore, the beauty of flowers, all these turn the thoughtful soul in upon itself with joyful awe and reverence. The strange, inscrutable pleasure—a pleasure almost akin to pain—which these and all natural beauty give to those gifted with keen feeling or penetrating insight, what is its cause, its source? Surely, it is some sympathy, some faint realization of there being some affinity in the soul with the soul of all beauty. "Nature is the living, visible garment of God," says Goethe, and they seem to find echo in Carlyle when he writes: "Creation is the time vesture of God that reveals Him to the wise and hides Him from the foolish." It is the deep calling to deep, the soul in the presence of the handiwork of the Creator of them both.

It has often been remarked with regard to trees and herbs that their life shares in many respects the qualities which distinguish organized living beings; they breathe, absorb, assimilate, perspire, sleep by night and awaken to the day; frequently they differ in sex, sympathize with each other or dislike each other, even their passions being traceable and in many other ways claiming kinship with animal life. The oak is said to dislike the olive and walnut, the whitethorns have an antipathy to blackthorns or sloes, the vine to cabbage and cyclamen, reeds to ferns, Roman tree to juniper, and strong personal prejudices exist between rosemary and lavender, bay thyme and marjoram, while the rose loves the onion and figs the rue.

This animated existence of plants has often been perceived and noticed in every age of the world and embodied in mystic tale. Philo, the most Christian of all the Jews, in his book upon the creation of the world, says that in the fair garden of the Creator's own planting there was the antitype of what we have now but in type, the substance of which we have now but the shadow; our gardens are irrational, but the trees that were planted in the earthly Paradise had soul and were rational, so that by eating the fruit of one it was possible to obtain virtues in the same way as by eating of the forbidden tree was obtained knowledge of good and evil. At least, they were appointed as emblematic of the most awful ideas—life and happiness, death and misery.

There seems to have been a similar underlying thought in the Greek mythologies in which all nature was regarded as living and in which transitions from one form to another were as reasonable to their minds as chemical analysis and composition are to ours. To them there was nothing gross or startling in such a doctrine; transformation was simply the work of an omnipotent hand exhibiting the same life under an altered type, and as such it deserved the same regard as it possessed previously. Even with all ages past to help us we are ignorant as to where plant life ends and animal life begins.

Indeed, all generations of thoughtful men have even felt how preternatural all nature is. In flowers there seems to exist a power which in its influence upon character is stronger than that exercised by any other division of what we call the irrational world. They still seem to retain something of that wondrous vigor of which Philo speaks and which, no doubt, pervaded everything to a greater degree than now in the day when "God walked in the garden in the cool of the evening." In all ages and countries their companionship has been sought and valued, for they have a sympathetic power of their own which defies analysis. Its effect is not confined to any class or standard of culture or age, but universally perceived, and so innate is this in the human mind that we cannot ally them with the conception of anything evil or demoniacal, but they suggest righteousness and paths of peace. To the great majority of people who care for them there can never be to any extent much appreciable botanical interest in them; that is to say, the scientific aspect of each herb is quite distinct, and very few can be expected to value a garden from this aspect; it is the external qualities of color, grace, grouping and perfume that appeal usually, the satisfying of the sense of beauty and harmony. We plead for the introduction of another interest, enhancing the preciousness of what we may already possess by bringing forward what we may style a literary or historical element into the selection of our trees, shrubs and plants, or at least by making the arrangement of a part of our garden to be governed by some object beyond those we have already mentioned, one that would be grateful to man's intellectual qualities through every season of the year. We are not going to attack the principle that so widely prevails of dedicating the greater portion of the garden to the wretched conventionality of imitating in herbage a common carpet design or that of geometrical oilcloths; we pass by all beddings of the florist's formal array and leave the barren expanses of graveled walks for such minds as are so vacuous as to feel satisfaction therein. The mind that can regard a plant as a piece of material to be worked up into a decorative design of this kind is not likely to be one that would appreciate flowers grown to show their individuality or value them from an artist's point of view. Indeed, a garden is not a place primarily for flowers, like a turnip field is for turnips; they are but adjuncts and ornaments, and as such should have definite reason for their use. Here for color, there for rarity or some historic or artistic object, adding to, not supplanting, the delights of pleached alleys, vistas cut through the thickets, of shadowy glades, wildernesses of old-fashioned flowers, a confused nosegay of scent and color. Quite one of the primary and fundamental ideas in every selection should be that of perfume—that the garden should possess a quantity of shrubs and herbs that are sweet-smelling, yielding a fragrance to every passing breeze or responsive to the passerby when brushed by robe or pressed by foot. Sweetbriars, mock-orange, double-gorse and brooms should be in every grove where they will grow. Myrtle, lavender, rosemary, balm of Gilead, southernwood, fern gale, bog myrtle, juniper, thyme, marjoram, wormwood, tansy, santoline, chamomile, woodruff, dittany and a number of similar ones should be found there if possible.

We make rock-walks sometimes, but never do we see attempted, even where space is no object, a maze for the children or a bleached alley for summer's heat. Old yew hedges abound, but seldom or never do we plant new ones to give those spacious arbors in their embrace which many an old garden retains. Like in all modern art, our imaginative faculties seem to have dwindled to extinction.

It is remarkable that wherever the Catholic Church has been long enough established to permeate the majority of the people that the world around becomes christened. The streets and waysides bear the names and figures of the friends of God, the Virgin Mother recalls the Incarnation of man's Redeemer as she gazes down upon us from every point of vantage, and the cross of self-sacrifice appears on all sides. Even to trivial things is this sacred association carried, so that the repetition of pious thought perfumes the mind of man and leaves an oriental fragrance in the very air. Things of earth were thus linked with thoughts of heaven and the humble flower might bear the holiest of names. What more beautiful system of memories could there be for the beauteous flora which we know now as bearing so impossible a scientific nomenclature? Yet how we have ignored and even forgotten its existence. Once it was common to all Catholic folk wherever the herb grew, and it is only indifference or apostasy that has made it a lost language. In many lands it lingers still, but in England when the people were robbed of their heritage of the faith the flowers were robbed of their heritage of silently teaching it likewise and given alien, meaningless or heathen names, or the old ones were clipped and defaced. The balsamic virtues of those flowers taking titles from saints who strove with disease and death were dissociated. "Love-lies-a-bleeding," the sweetly poetic form in England of what elsewhere is "The Scourge of Our Blessed Lord"—one name explaining the other—lost all its holy reference; "Lords and Ladies" supplanted "Our Lord and Our Lady" wherever it occurred; the purple spike of the arum beneath its spathe which once spoke of their statues enshrined in niches became "Parson in Pulpit;" the very symbolism of the title "Virgin's Bower" was forgotten and thought to refer to Queen Elizabeth, and in this way even the flora was "reformed."

Those who learn to appreciate the sacred dedications of the flowers are the least likely to treat them irreverently, and few things would prompt one more to study a plant for itself, look well into its beauties of leaf and blossom, mark its form of root and learn its virtues. Such a study is singularly helpful in many unsuspected ways, even leading the mind to form a sublimer conception of the Maker of this world. Perhaps it was the result of not knowing a personal Creator that made the Greeks and Romans so comparatively unappreciative of nature, although Buddhism, at least in its Japanese form, cannot be accused of this and yet is without such a conception. Pantheism peopled the mountains and groves with deities, but it produced the sense of fear and awe upon the mind apparently, instead of love and admiration. It taught a change of nymphs and dryads into flowers and trees without attracting any personal affection to them, and its deification of the physical aspects and harmonies of nature created no delight and gratitude to the great source of it all, such as rises first to the lips of a Job, a David or a St. Francis; nothing similar is found in Homer, Treveritus or Virgil. But to us Catholics this sense of gratitude and wonder at the good God's manifestations of His power and beauty is intensified and appeals to the mind in many different ways when we connect the flowers and trees with sacred associations and learn how other minds have regarded with the same feeling some simple weed which however humble reveals a mine of miracle and beauty to the reverent student.

All parents should teach their children a reverence towards flowers, both in the garden, on the wayside, and nothing helps to this end so well as encouraging them to learn the sacred associations which Catholic peoples have allied through long ages to many of them. One of the worst features of to-day is the ruthlessness with which floral and animal life is treated by the majority of English-speaking people. Flowers are sought only to be plucked, the blossoming trees, such as mays, laburnums and lilacs, will be torn down and recklessly ruined, and all this radiant beauty will often be found cast aside when the hot hand has made the blossoms droop or the eye is weary of those showering crowns of silver and gold. Or take the corresponding scene in a ballroom, where what would prove several years' income for a poor man is spent on a night's decoration with cut flowers, too profuse for real appreciation by the eye, too wanton a waste for that of the mind, too artificially and vulgarly massed for that of the artist. How different is all this to what may be seen in Japan, where culture is a reality, not an empty term; there crowds of every class, from the rich and powerful to the poorest peasant, may be seen any day in April or May going for a day's outing and spending it in happy, quiet, social enjoyment, seated in the presence of groves of cherry, or plum in blossom, or flaming azaleas, satisfied with the feast of the eye and storing up the memory of the picture before them. Never a twig will be carelessly injured, and if anything be gathered, it will be some single flower or curious growth of bough to place in the vase of their dwelling. Yet no home is without its little "garden of Adonis" or its miniature quadrangle of rockery and pool. When our upper and lower classes have become as truly refined as a Japanese peasant there will be some reason for us to be proud of our regard for nature and to boast of our civilization.

The extent of the sacred dedications of plants is quite astonishing; even in the book* relating to the events in Our Lord's life, from the Nativity to the Flight into Egypt, there are five hundred references, and not those of a writer's fancy, but found in the words of those botanists who give the local names of the flora they enumerate, or collected from folklore authorities. If we add to this the numerous dedications to the Passion of Our Lord and those to the Blessed Virgin and the saints, it will be seen that the number must be very large. Yet these are only a portion of what must exist: there are stores entirely unexplored, such as those of Russia, Roumania and those Eastern lands of Europe which are Christian; Armenia, too, whose peasant only sings of flowers and birds, all his similes being ornithological or botanical. Even Arabia and Syria must have many poetic and interesting Old Testament references in their folk names. How so copious a nomenclature originated is a natural inquiry, and the answer no doubt is that these titles have been given by simple folk whose days were spent in the occupations of rural life, from the plants appearing at the season of the saint or commemoration, from being related in tradition, or recalling by some sign or form or symbol the subject of its reference. Others get their names from the monastic simply by reason of their use in certain ailments for which a St. Anthony or a St. Roch was the sufferer's patron, others from their employment in ecclesiastical ritual. These are some of the reasons probably of their source. This peasant-lore was never collected or written down, but handed on from father to son, from mother to child, like other traditional customs and legends through many generations of the human race, until, like the beatification of most of the early saints, it was popular acclaim that gave authority to their name. Next came the seventeenth century herbalists, recording these among the accepted names of their times, and the study of scientific folklore has registered them anew in our day. In the wonderful twelfth century, when the creative breath of Holy Church had produced a new earth and new heaven out of the ruins of the Roman Empire and its shattered beliefs, man's life was entirely regenerated in the universal triumph of Christian principles. Law and science, literature and art were then fully possessed by the spirit of Christianity; it became in truth the national spirit, and the strange sympathy and correspondence between inanimate nature and grace found an outlet and exponent in the enthusiasm of St. Francis of Assisi. It is nature and the visible creation that inspire the Franciscan poets. Spreading rapidly throughout Europe, they influence the minds of Christendom to a contemplation of the wonders and beauty of the world about them in a remarkable degree. The grey friar was to be found in every country, wandering in the byways of every land, preaching to the masses, telling to them the story of the ecstatic love of his founder for light and flower and bird, holding him up as a model and standard, drawing, like his master, his similes and lessons from the familiar things about him, and by ox-crib nativity or passion play bringing home to the simplest minds the minute details in the story of their redemption. It was this tender love of St. Francis for all things animate and inanimate and his enthusiastic spirit infused into all christened lands by his followers that led pious minds to look for similes of their thought in the natural creation about them; to hearts thus inspired the flowers flushed with a new beauty, the birds sang a new song and earth was no empty and bare wilderness to the Christian soul, but stamped with immortal loveliness, for everything told of the faith. Hopefulness was the teaching of all around and earth paid back the love bestowed upon it by ministering to faith. Each season and feast had its ready tribute to offer to a good God by a world grateful to Him for having visited and redeemed it to Himself; in the choral song of the birds or in their plumage, in the varying habits or appearance of trees and herbs, in the very stars of the firmament they saw so many mystic renderings of the sacred truths of religion.

---

* "The Flora of the Sacred Nativity," by N. E. P. Raymund Dowling, B. A., Oxon., Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., London.

Earth and heaven were united by the ladder of faith, type responded to antitype and the Creator of the one was also the Creator of the other. He made both for His glory, and both were good and beautiful in their varying degree. The innocence, holiness and beauty of Mary seemed reflected in the purity and fragrance of many a flower, and countless numbers repeated her name to her devoted children and expressed their tenderest and deepest feelings. Her titles, even each varied garment she had worn here below, the herbs her touch had rendered salutary or aromatic, were all represented by some more gracious than their fellows: they were like relics scattered on all sides and incessantly renewed; not confined to those flowers whose beauty alone is attractive, but extended more to the virtuous and humble; not confined to the garden of the rich or the monastery enclosure, but springing up in the meadows and waysides, recognized by the poorest of earth's pilgrims as he trod his lonely path, speaking of faith, breathing hope and leading him to lay his burden of care at the feet of his loving patroness and friend. To him who had once become familiar with the sacred associations with which the children of the old Church in quiet days had woven about all nature, type and emblem were forever presenting themselves in so fascinating a fashion that both mind and soul were benefited; to him the country would never be dull or lacking interest, for nature would prove too versatile a companion

And whenever the way seemed long
  Or his heart began to fail,
She would sing a more wonderful song
  Or tell a more wonderful tale. —Longfellow.

Just as the burning rays which, darting from the wounds of Christ, had impressed their stigmata on the body of St. Francis, so the intense and ardent faith of mediæval time stamped with the seal of pious love each object in nature and made it an apostle of the faith. Not only were birds and flowers thus enlisted, making a "nus redolens in diebus aestatis"—a sweet incense fragrance in summer days—but when winter chilled the ground and birds were silent and flowers were gone, then men turned their eyes to the star-strewn deep of space and again learned the lesson amid the darkness of the night. There they would see the Milky Way, not of Juno, but of Walsingham or Jerusalem, or else the pilgrim road to Rome or Campostella, according to the land where it was observed. Orion's Belt became to them Mary's Distaff, St. Peter's Staff, St. Fillan's Army, St. Bridget's Cord, St. Patrick's Stock or the Three Magi, in varying lands; while Ursa Major was known as St. Peter's Bark or St. Martin's Throne. Thus from earth to heaven, from changing season to season and from day to night there were forever appealing to man's eyes objects which spoke in a language poetical and penetrating, and there was the opportunity of making "your conversation in heaven," for nature and grace responded to each other in antiphonal chant by night and day.

In older days—as in the latest development of medical science—herbs were the main components of the pharmacopœia, and the work of tending the sick is a corporal work of mercy of which the religious of both sexes have never been neglectful. It is of interest to note that about most cloistral remains in England may be found wandering in uncared for wantonness exotic plants which must have been introduced by their former tenants, evidently brought from afar by them for the purpose of ministering to human suffering, and which now have planted themselves and kept up their pedigree for four hundred years. There were not originally English, but foreign, and planted for a medicinal purpose, and often bear the name of the saint to whom the poor patient was wont to go in the particular complaint for which they were remedial. Brunfels, Fuchs, Bock, Mattioli and other authors of the earliest herbals regarded plants only for their medical value, as ingredients in compounds of which they formed the "simples," and it is curious to remark how the flower, which to us has become the part most regarded, is amongst them little noticed or entirely omitted.

For those who would wish to make religious art vivid and vocal, instead of conventional or fanciful, the flora of the Church should be acceptable as a store from which to draw significant detail wherewith to enrich picture or carving, and there are likewise plenty of similar dedications among birds and animals and fishes. To use them not only beautifies, but aids in making the subject more homely and familiar to the beholder; it will have a secondary effect, it is true, in creating an interest in the flora and fauna employed. The beholder once attracted by the use of this bird or flower with a particular subject or person, will ask the reason and henceforth look upon it with fresh curiosity, so that the one will recall the other. This is exactly what was the object desired by the creating of a sacred nomenclature, that it should remind us of great truths in careless or listless moments.

The very fact that there is a store of meaning in every detail of an artist's work is an incentive to study him, especially if it be known that he does not base himself upon his private caprice and fancy, but upon historical tradition. Let us illustrate what would be possible in the case of a picture of St. Peter, for example. In this instance, of course, we have tradition to guide us as to the personal appearance of the saint. Nicephorus Callixtus has described it, and the Canon of the Second Council of Nicæa was prompted in reference to it; the color of his robe has been assigned by ancient custom and appears in the banner of the Roman Pontiff to-day; even a heraldry has been bestowed upon him. Of his two keys, one is golden and the other silver, as Dante describes, and their wards are often reversed and form an inverted cross in allusion to his couch of martyrdom. If we seek a flora for his feet, there are fifty-six or more varieties for our choice which bear his name, either from flowering at his feasts, in reference to his cross, tears, keys, staff, tiara or beard. Some are beautiful emblems of his office, such as the samphire—St. Pierre—bearing his name growing upon the rocks of our shores, just beyond the destructive power of the waves, which the shipwrecked mariner beholding knows that he is safe, as Peter's Church is the safe refuge in the storms of life. Do we need birds in the air to cerrespond to chanticleer on earth or the petrel walking on the waters; then the kingfisher, the black guillemot and the bee-eater are all his. The memory of the finding of the tribute-money and other events is perpetuated in the lore of the fisherman. The weever, John Dory and Haddock, each bears his name, and in the cartoon at Hampton Court by Raphael the great artist did not disdain to find in them an intensification of his subject when he drew the "Miraculous Draught" in the Galilean lake. Many a seashell by its name allies itself to the Apostle's calling, and even the very stars preserve his memory, Orion's belt being his staff and the Ursa Major constellation the Navicula Petri.

We have let this old and pious nomenclature die out amongst us, often to extinction, but yet we can regain much of it if we will. If Catholics would be proud of their old traditions and go back to times before the Renaissance blighted the natural development of their art and literature! If they would but read by the light of the lamp that hath seven branches, instead of using one taken from some pagan sepulchre! Then we should recover much of that poetry and beauty of life which is ever ready to spring into being wherever the faith is vigorous.

But the use of the sacred flora, etc., in the arts might be adversely commented upon in these days by the argument that the plants, etc., did not exist in the land or spot depicted, or were unknown at the time; while others will say that only the local flora, etc., should be employed or only local dedications be recognized. We should, however, remember that a religious picture does not aim at historic accuracy, but devotional intention. It is very rarely that we have historic help to guide us as to the personal appearance of the saints; we have in the cases of SS. Peter and Paul, as we have in that of Our Lord Himself, but, unless of later times, other examples are unknown.

We may guess with some probability as to their vesture from what we see in the unchanging East, and we may supply a background from the scene of their lives, but, as a rule, it is not historic accuracy that we want so much as a devotional setting. We find views of old Florence behind the Assumption, or those of other towns or landscapes often employed by the early masters of Italian art, and contemporaneous drapery almost invariably, all historically inaccurate, but devotionally perfect. And it is this devotional truth that we want in church decoration and for its setting to be suitable and not trivial or frivolous. The object aimed at by Holy Church in decorating wall and window space is to prompt and bring the soul in its contemplation of a face the historic certitude of which is in her keeping, but all detail employed should appeal to the mind as being congruous by its symbolism or dedication.

Again, the Church is Catholic, not local or even national, and the pious practices and traditions found in one section of her children may justly be adopted by any other if they will. The beautiful rite of the Benediction service, the great feast of Corpus Christi and many others originated as local practices; now they are universal. The meadow lychnis or ragged robin is one of the flowers of the Blessed Sacrament in comparatively local districts; there is no reason why it should not be acknowledged as such wherever it is found. The Corona de Cristo is apparently only known in its lovely significance to the people of Spain and the Balearic Isles, but England has become acquainted with it and has called it Calvary flower; soon it will be of universal recognition by pious children of Holy Church. The Passion flower is neither a European nor a Holy Land native, not even an ancient dedication, yet everywhere now we are familiar with it and accept its presence in picture or carving as suitable.

As an illustration of how much meaning we may miss by not knowing the folklore of the Church let us refer to the celebrated engraving by Albert Durer representing St. Jerome in his cell. Copies of it are well known, and the small adjunct of a plant is the key to the saint's occupation, which is entirely unrecognized in the descriptions of this beautiful etching. St. Jerome is writing in a room from the roof of which hangs a bottle gourd, usually considered an accessory from the artist's fancy suitable to the pilgrim-sought Bethlehem, where the saint lived and wrote.

But, in fact, this gourd tells of a very lively dispute that arose over the change that St. Jerome made in the Vulgate of the plant that sheltered the prophet Jonas. He rendered it *hedera,* and thought it to be a species of ivy, hanging up the gourd as a popular error. The Septuagint and Syriac Versions, besides many other authoritative writings, were arrayed against the translator and no effort spared to get Jonas' Gourd reinstated; to those fiery Eastern disputants any change so patent was rank heresy, and the great doctor of the Church is in this etching defending himself against his detractors, with the gourd still suspended. Centuries have now passed by and men have forgotten the old dispute, and of recent years neither gourd nor ivy has been deemed so probable as a creeper of broad palmate leaf which the rabbis call *el-kheroua,* or the castor tree; this had its roots on the banks of the Tigris three thousand odd years ago, and, moreover, retains them to-day in Ninevite, Christian and Jewish local tradition as Jonas' "Gourd."

The picture of Sancta Paupertas painted by Giotto at Assisi is another example of a great master intensifying the meaning of his work by the use of detail taken from the folklore of the flowers. Mr. Ruskin tells us what he read in it. "I have just been drawing, or trying to draw, Giotto's 'Poverty' (Sancta Paupertas) at Assisi. You may very likely know the chief symbolism of the picture: that Poverty is being married to St. Francis and that Christ marries them, while her bare feet are entangled in thorns, but behind her head is a thicket of rose and lily. It is less likely you should be acquainted with the further details of the group. The thorns are of the acacia, which according to tradition was used to weave Christ's crown. The roses are in two clusters—palest red and deep crimson, the one on her right and the other on her left." Strangely enough, Mr. Ruskin does not notice their significance and appears to be ignorant of the story of the saint having twice rolled himself in briar rose bushes to subdue the evil promptings of the flesh. Throughout Italy, Spain and France the briar was known as St. Francis' thorn, and those at Subiaco have a remarkable peculiarity, for in the autumn a kind of blight comes on the leaves, which assume the form of a serpent, and this is taken to be a perpetual memorial of the saint's victory, while those at Santa Maria degli Angeli have lost their spines and have leaves stained by a spot as of blood.

We might go on to show how in carving, as in painting, the old artists made religious art vivid and vocal in its very detail, and by all who seek that end the traditional flora and fauna of the Church's children should be studied. To those who would have their gardens no longer ministering so entirely to the æsthetic side of our nature, but rather to man's mental appreciation and interest, to such we commend the planting of a hortus conclusus, a "speaking garden," as an old herbalist says, where we can wander among flowers radiant with fair names of the friends of God and where we can learn how honeysuckle, marjoram, thyme and many a fragrant plant are aromatic with thoughts of heaven and how the humblest herbs as well as the most gorgeous blossoms are making our land glad with their song of "Ave Maria" to those whose ears faith has opened.

A. E. P. Raymund Dowling.

Pall Mall, London.

CATHOLIC ASPECTS OF POLITICAL SPAIN.

HOW comes it that Spain, a Catholic nation, has not a Catholic, but a very non-Catholic government? This question is often asked by Catholics of other countries in a certain tone of unmistakable wonder. And rightly so. For it is a wonderful as well as a puzzling problem to understand how a majority of stout Catholic Spaniards will allow a Liberal government to trample on their religious rights, to scoff at the belief of their forefathers or with incessant strivings endeavor to wean from the Church of Peter that grand and glorious old Catholic gentry.

At first glance the situation seems paradoxical. But the paradox is only an apparent one, for the condition of Spain is but the result and natural consequence of warring political factions whose genesis and exploits, whose aims and arms are unknown to the world-wide mass of Catholics ignorant of the political conditions of Spain. A brief study of this intricate situation cannot fail to be of special interest to our readers.

The present political parties of Spain are three in number: the Catholic, the Liberal and the Republican.

To be of the Catholic party means to be a Carlist, or an integrist or a free lance—that is, a man belonging to no fixed school, holding no dogmatic political creed, yet presenting himself at the ballot-box as a Catholic voter.

On the other hand, if we consider the Liberal party, it presents two well-marked divisions, each with its particular and clear-cut tendencies, its methods and manners of action, its forwardness or its reserve: the Liberals properly so-called, or Radicals and the Conservatives. Now, strange as the statement may appear, the Radical-Liberal party, as a party, stands for hostility and hatred to the Church; nevertheless, many Liberals are good Catholics, who from the very stress of circumstances are forced to vote the Liberal ticket. This must not be lost sight of. Furthermore, the Conservative is the man influenced by Liberal ideas. He is somewhat of a weakling; in politics he complies to the will and clings to the opinions of the Radical-Liberal party, and yet he is more sober-minded in his views and is commonly guided—blindly enough, to be sure—by good intention in his decisions. In this study, when we speak of the Liberal party, we understand the Radical-Liberals and not the Conservative-Liberals.

Thirdly, by the Republican party in Spain, we mean that charivari of all the fickle and flighty political elements whose one purpose is to plot against order and society, against altar and throne. These, therefore, are the three great forces disputing the political supremacy in the arena of Spain, and from their action and reaction, amid the jostling of their conflict, we must seek the solution of the problem that confronts us.

In this struggle we shall especially examine the position of the Catholics and that of the Liberals, for here is the Gordian knot. Here also it is well to note that many Liberals are fervent and practical Catholics. This is true in a marked manner of many Conservatives. Still, the party to which they belong is called by a name which exactly expresses its political views.

Now, if we consider the Catholic party, the Carlists and the Integrists, its two main battalions, hold the same staunch Catholic policy. In fact, the Integrists cling to Catholic teachings so tenaciously in theory and so energetically in practice that they will not yield one jot or tittle under any circumstance when it is a matter of principle or a question, say, for instance, of religious education. Hence the name of Integrist. It is evidently well chosen. They are men who stand, not by a part, but by the whole Catholic platform in its every detail, in its every department. With them, no half-hearted measures, no compromise with political heresy. And in this stern loyalty to Catholicity, Carlists and Integrists are one being with the same body, and, if principles are the soul of a party, with the same soul. However, whilst the Integrists do not care whether this or that branch of the ruling dynasty guide the destinies of the monarchy, provided it guides them true to Catholic ideals and Catholic standards, the Carlists are of a very different opinion. They will have no king but one. They claim the crown of Spain for Don James, son of Charles VII., and for his successors. Is it strange, then, that Catholic Spain should have a non-Catholic government? No, not if we bear in mind this schism of the party into Carlists and Integrists and remember that the Radical is at hand to take advantage of the dissension to further his own irreligious projects. It is the old story of shepherds fighting and the wolves feasting—a bloody enough tale as far as the sheep are concerned.

This is surely a bad enough state of affairs, but what is worse, no solution offers until the bone is removed, until the question between Don James and Don Alfonso is settled and their adherents band themselves together in a solid phalanx against Radicalism. Spain must continue unchanged until the present political atmosphere changes. The situation is plain enough. Three parties could helm the ship of state in Spain: the Catholic, the Radical or the Conservative party. Republicanism is not to be thought of; it is out of the field. Now, the Carlists and Integrists, repudiated on account of their lofty ideals and obnoxious because of their strict standards, have lost all chance of grasping the helm. So in steps the Radical, with a well united party and a decided purpose, grasps the spokes with both hands, directs and rules according to his fancy, and his fancy is not Catholic politics. This, then, is the reason why Liberalism, in one form or another, has for many years set the course and direction of Spanish government.

That the Carlists cannot accept the direction of politics in Spain, even were it offered to them—which it is not—by the present monarchy, is a matter clear enough. Their acceptance would be a public and official recognition of the present King, Don Alfonso XIII., as well as an overt official rejection of the alleged rights of Don James and the dynasty of Charles. To expect such a course of action from the Carlists is to expect the radically impossible, if we are to judge them by their historic fidelity to their cause and by their blue-blooded loyalty to their sovereign and his successors.

So much, then, for the Carlist position, and the Integrists are more or less in the same plight, though for different reasons. First of all, the Integrists are not numerous nor strong enough to support a solid Cabinet capable of withstanding the combined and coalized forces of Liberalism and Republicanism. In such an event, these would unite, use every effort, stop at no consideration, set in motion every secret resource to upset a Catholic Cabinet, the carrying out of whose platform would mean their complete annihilation. Besides, granting that the Integrists are strong enough to face and victoriously rout the opposition, if their name is rightly given them—and it is; if they are true to their principles—and they are; if they are steadfast of purpose—and who doubts it? if they will carry out every part and parcel of their programme—and they will; then they cannot accept the sceptre of power except on the condition of ruling Spain in their whole-souled Catholic way. What, then, would follow? Simply this: they could not recognize as not to be changed nor hold as other than impossible the present Liberal Constitution. Indeed, no situation to be held, no station to be occupied, no position to be filled would permit them to take as a rule of political conduct a civil code not only at variance with, but in many points diametrically opposed to the teachings of the Church and their own political religion. To follow any other course of action would be to deny in practice what they affirm in theory. Could they destroy the present régime without bringing about some tremendous upheaval? Their path is evidently strewn with difficulties, but another is open to them. Would it not be the most practical plan to endeavor by every means to acquire influence and power, and then to reform and modify little by little this digest of anti-Catholic Liberal laws? Granted that the Integrists have not sufficient numbers to uphold a Cabinet, why should they refuse positions in the Liberal Cabinet where they could act as a check upon the extravagances of the anti-clericals? Would that the Integrists might adopt so sane a policy, but at present the wind blows from every quarter but this, and the fair dream of a courageous Catholic confederation in Spain is one far from realization.

Oppressed and disunited by such parliamentary strife, it is quite clear why Catholic Spain has a Radical government, and it is clearer still that neither the star of Carlist nor Intergrist can rise in the ascendant. And as there remains no other but the Liberal party capable of commanding the political situation of Spain, the Liberals by the very force of circumstances must rule. The problem is a difficult one to grasp for an American Catholic and one which has few parallels in history. But hard as it is to grasp the problem in its countless side issues, it is yet harder to find for it an adequate and satisfactory solution.

Closely connected with the question which we have so far dwelt upon is another fully as mysterious, we believe, to the American Catholic. If the Catholic party cannot force itself to the front and control the Government, why can it not at least elect a number of Catholic Deputies strong enough to cope with the anti-religious schemes of the Radicals? Our answer is short and clear: nothing short of a miracle could bring about this longed-for state of affairs. Whilst treating of this topic the observations already made concerning the Liberal party must not be forgotten.

If we except a spice of Republicans and Socialists, all who present themselves at election time as eligible Deputies are Catholics and will be thought of and spoken of as nothing but Catholics. This is true, as a rule, of the candidates, no matter what their party; and this is important, because it explains the action of the voters and because it gives the reason why there are in Spain so few Congressmen of the Catholic party. No public man would propose himself for an office under any other title. All claim the right of being called Catholics. They brook no other denomination but that of Catholic; they scorn any other appellation but that of Catholic; they see, they hear, they judge as Catholics; they resume their broken off intimacies with Catholic friends; their insignia show to the chance passerby and the observant citizen that they are Catholics; they flaunt Catholic colors on every occasion; in brief, no public man is aught but a Catholic in Spain. Indeed, a critic would look long and hard to find a candidate who does not profess Catholicism, but he would look and look in vain to find a non-Catholic candidate at election time. Why is this? Because were such a postulant to make profession of any other faith, he would not only risk all his chances of being elected, but so strong is the faith of the people, that he would irreparably shatter them. Here, then, we have the reason why, when the great race of office is on, the most skeptic place-seeker parades his religion before the public, swears dauntless fealty to the Church, solemnly asseverates that he will do nothing and permit nothing to be done in the Assembly in any way harmful or derogatory to the dignity of the Spouse of Christ and blatantly affirms that he will defend unflinchingly its glorious prerogatives.

Now, the voters, and this is true in a marked manner of the lower classes, know that all the candidates, no matter what their party —always excepting the Republicans—are Catholics; the voters will cast their votes according to their religious convictions; but they will also vote for those from whom they expect the greatest advantages and the greatest increase of their material interests. So when the Catholic party proposes a man as a worthy representative and the party in control presents its postulant for the same position, the candidate of the ruling faction is generally successful, for the voters reason somewhat as follows: both men are Catholics, but evidently the candidate of the present government can do more for us in the Assembly, since his party is the strongest; therefore, it is better to vote for him. Thus the man proposed for a given office by the ruling party secures his position by a sophism of circumstances and a show of fidelity to his faith. But what follows once the Liberal has been elected? The people frequently find that they have been duped and deceived; that the promises given were never fulfilled; that those who made parade of their Catholicism were hypocrites; that the place-hunters who swore they would resign from the Cortes rather than prove false to their faith would not speak a word against abominable laws framed to destroy it; they find out to their bitter sorrow that show honesty, trickery of rhetoric, appearance of logic cleared the way for the election of unbelieving Radicals.

However, they are often even more completely led astray, for now and then they are permitted to win some slight victory, to obtain some trifling consideration, and so, when the next election comes round, they vote for the man from whom, for example, they expect a lower rate of taxation without considering whether he is of the Liberal or Catholic party, and, above all, without scrutinizing the tendencies of his party as a whole. We must keep this always in mind; the policy of the Liberal party is bad; many of its individual members are honest, well-meaning Catholics.

It is clear enough, then, that, were the circumstances which surround the candidacy of many of these office-seekers clearly understood by the people; were the idea fully grasped, that the time for a citizen to dissect the character of an aspirant is before he is nominated; were the purpose of the parties of the competitors unmasked; could the masses read the applicants, and by some unfailing test, sift the chaff from the wheat, not a single honest vote would fall in the ballot-box for the Liberals, whilst, on the other hand, the Catholic party would guide unerringly the government of Catholic Spain. But do we not ask for the impossible? Were not the fisherfolk of Galilee long wheedled by the Pharisees?

But still, not only does the religion of the Liberal candidates deceive the uneducated voters, but other causes also militate for their successful candidature. Among these is the almost universal support which they receive. In fact, the candidate of the Liberal party, first of all, has the firm support of his entire party, that also of many who, although they do not belong to the faction, still are under obligation in some way or other to its influential leaders; thirdly, that of others who must vote for the candidate pointed out to them under penalty of losing their political position, and in many cases even the means of honest livelihood. They sweep in, therefore, the votes of the party, the votes of those indebted to the party and the votes of many dominated by the party.

That many are indebted to the Liberals, even sturdy and practical Catholics, is a well-known fact. For during the long years in which Liberalism has held undisputed sway in Spain they have fortified their position by granting public offices to some, by bestowing favors to others, by making concessions to the strong and by strengthening their hold on the weak. To do this they have spared neither time nor trouble nor money. Adulation and honors, positions and promises, all have been called into requisition to secure their grasp on the directing levers of the government. The credit of the Radicals is as great as the obligations of its debtors. Hence it is that through such practices they control a vast number of votes, for since so many are indebted to the party for whatever influence, position or wealth they enjoy, a certain political gratitude forces them to support their creditors.

But whilst the debtors of the Liberal party become its mainstay, many dominated by its leaders contribute no less to the stability and security of its success. Nowhere is the indifference of the people more in evidence than in the thoughtless surrender of the ballot-box into the hands of the Caciques. A Cacique in Spain may be the Mayor of a small town, an influential man in a country district, a landlord or a "boss" of a village; in a word, any person to whom the peasantry looks up as a man who knows the condition of affairs can read the weather forecast of the political day and discern the right man for the right place. These simple people, interested only in raising their crops or in tending their flocks, gladly leave the care of politics to the acknowledged leader of the countryside. Nothing loath, the Cacique reaps in the rich harvest of votes for the Liberals at the cheap cost of a bombastic oration or two. Thus the guilelessness and gullibility of the peasantry dominated by their leaders plays an important rôle at the polls and greatly strengthens the position of the Progressives.

But in spite of this overwhelming support which the Liberal party receives from its members, its debtors and its unwitting upholders, many more Catholics would be sent to Congress were it not for the terrible inroads which Republicanism is making among the less educated. The barbaric and uncivilized proceedings of Barcelona, in July, 1909, express in the smoke and fire of burning churches, in the profanations of the monuments of the dead, in the murder of defenseless nuns, the means and methods which Socialists, Anarchists, Acratists and the whole tribe of anti-religious sectaries employ to furtheir their plans, to give tongue to their political aspirations and to influence an ignorant population. Are such methods of canvassing permissible to Catholics? And the government, has it not greater and more numerous resources to prosecute the election of its officers? Are the methods it employs constitutional and always in strict harmony with the laws of the nation? Facts are more eloquent than words. Let them speak and let each reader judge for himself.

To give another instance of what we mean, is it not a very strange and startling fact that the faction in power, whether Radical or Conservative, has always a far greater number of representatives in Congress than the opposition and that the same faction when the tables are turned is always a small minority in the Assembly? There is not, during the long period in which the Radicals and Conservatives have been alternately rulers of Spain, one single case on record in which the faction in power has ever been defeated in the general elections. Now, is it possible that during the remarkably short interim that intervenes between the last moment in which the party is actually in office and the general elections that the opinion of the whole nation has been so completely and universally changed? And is it rational to believe for an instant that such a change could take place when we consider the brief periods that elapse between successive general elections in Spain?

With these facts before us, the election of every Catholic Deputy cannot but be regarded as a glorious triumph, and his struggle for a chair in Congress a bloodless, but a very hard-fought battle, fought to the bitter end against the enemies of the Church. And in the midst of these turbulent affairs what sight is more consoling than that of the shepherds of the flock, priests and religious mingled, with the throng of Catholic voters, taking their place in line with many illustrious Bishops and waiting for their turn at the polls, surrounded by the threats and menaces of a scoffing mob, urged on by the bribes of the high priests to deter them from a resolution which means the downfall of a creedless government? Thus it is that the ramparts of irreligion are every day being sapped and weakened, their fortresses demolished, their positions of vantage captured, whilst leading Catholics are steadily acquiring influence and power on the stricken battlefield of Spanish politics.

Yet great battles must be fought and won; many strongholds must be taken and towers laid low before the victory is complete and the Cross triumphant. But it is our sincere hope that these few thoughts may disentangle the tangled skein of the political situation, may rectify wrong impressions and scatter prejudices against the political attitude and action of Spanish Catholics regarding the election of their Congressmen.

We have shown thus far why Catholic Spain must necessarily have a Liberal government and given the reason why the Catholic party is so poorly represented in the Cortes. An objection, however, will naturally occur to the reader: if the Liberal party is largely made up of Catholics, explain why its Cabinet is so Radical and its members the pronounced advocates of the so-called *Advanced Ideas?*

In the first place, and in justice to one branch of the Liberal party, the Conservatives are neither madcap Progressives nor ranting Liberals properly so-called. Keeping this in view, the answer to our question is easy enough, and it is found in the method of electing the leader and the members of the Cabinet. In truth, the nation, the members of the Liberal party, Congress, all these have nothing to do with the choice of the Cabinet. The selection of the Ministers that compose it depends on the Prime Minister, who in turn is chosen by the King according to the Constitution. None can interfere with the royal elect. But, you will say, is not the King a Catholic? Is he not free in the choice he makes of his Prime Minister? Yes, thank God, the King is a good and practical Catholic. So much for the first question. However, he is only theoretically and not practically free in the choice of his Prime Minister. The reason for this is a simple one; for when the voice of the nation has called the Radical or the Conservative party into office, Don Alfonso is to all purposes forced to select as Prime Minister the official leader of this party, whatever may be his religious ideas or his political views. To do otherwise would be to offer a public and official insult to the party, and that can be easily understood.

So then the King, free yet manacled, at liberty to choose, but not to reject, has appointed his Prime Minister, the Prime Minister now picks his Cabinet. Naturally the new Minister surrounds himself with men whose religious and political principles square with his own. And is it so difficult, is it impossible to find twelve questionable Catholics among the members of a great national party, granted that the bulk of the party is made up of good Catholics? The Cabinet chosen by the Prime Minister must now be recognized and approved by the King. Is not this another opportunity for the application of a corrective? Decidedly no, for the approval of His Majesty is a mere question of ceremony. Consequently, if the chosen members of the Cabinet are anti-clericals of the most acute type, there is no help for it; the King must accept them against his will. What other course is left him? Can he disapprove of the élite picked by the very man whom he has called to the highest function of the State? The man whom the nation regards as having his entire confidence? Can he rebuke this high functionary in the very first exercise of his new-born dignity by refusing to accept the men he has indicated as worthy and capable of directing the destinies of the monarchy, by impeaching his personal judgment and by taxing him with disloyalty to his faith? Can he brand them as a base and infamous partisan of revolutionaries banded together to destroy every vestige of that great Catholic nation which he has but now sworn the most solemn oath to protect? Clearly the King of Spain can make no move in this direction. Did he do so, he would not only wound to the very heart the feelings of the Minister's party, but would soon appear as the exciting cause of serious political complications.

The Cabinet once formed and approved by the King, in the manner prescribed by law, the people must accept it willingly or unwillingly. The rôle of the masses becomes one of pure, passive acquiescence in the matter. The only channel left to the people to oppose the impetus given to the government by the Cabinet is the Assembly. There, through the vigilant custodians of its interests, it can oppose the Cabinet and thwart its policy when not in accord with the material or religious welfare of the kingdom. Yet it is very seldom that success crowns the efforts of the people when it sets itself against the line of action pursued by the Ministry. No deep philosophy is required to bolster this statement. How, then, does the government circumvent the people? For instance, let us suppose that the government intends to pass a law against the Church. To begin with, Carlist, Integrist and a few Conservative Deputies unite and attack it, but they are a weak minority, whilst the governing faction has a large majority of Deputies and is backed up by the concentrated forces of all the Republicans, Socialists and anti-clericals. Sometimes they are even abetted by the Conservatives themselves, always trying to steer between Scylla and Charybdis. If the representatives of the party in power are true to it, the law is passed, the government triumphs and the Church is oppressed.

The programme described is usually carried out to the letter.

There are glorious exceptions—they but prove the rule. Many motives are at hand to urge the Liberal Deputies to give their votes as the government and not as conscience directs. Some will pass the law because they are bad Catholics, some because they will be ousted if they disobey instructions, many are led by human respect, others are weaklings, others craven, others yet too timid to be at outs with their party. The law is passed. Who will say now that an anti-Catholic law reflects the feeling and expresses the attitude of the Spanish people, although the government, with cunning and hypocrisy, to justify its action and to mislead the opinion of Catholics of other nations, trumpets to the four winds of heaven that this law is the expression of the will of the nation? Who will doubt us when we say that such laws have been enacted against the formal protest of the allied Catholic Deputies, against the solemn protest not only of a great part of the Cortes, but also of the unanimous Catholic people, which many times sprang up as one man in burning hatred against such tyranny, and sent up a cry of indignation that rang from the Pyrenees to the blue Mediterranean?

The magnificent spectacle and the striking demonstration of Catholicism given to the world by Spain when a Godless government strove to banish the catechism from the public schools is yet fresh in the memories of all. The Catholics of Spain were justly indignant at a scheme which aimed so directly at an atheistic education for their children; protestations poured in from every Catholic association; concerted demonstrations were made in every hamlet and city of Spain; the government was pressed on all sides to give up its nefarious object. What was the upshot of the whole affair? In spite of the remonstrances and protests of the nation, the government tyrannically carried out its anti-Catholic project, if not in its entire programme, at least in a goodly portion. What is to be done? Are the Spanish Catholics to take up arms and precipitate a revolution? Would such action be lawful? Would it be licit? Would it be according to moral principles? Clearly such a red-handed method of procedure is inadmissible.

Dismissing it, then, as repugnant to every Catholic principle, let us consider how the present Liberal government, under the leadership of Count Romanones, goes about anti-Catholic legislation. Ready to use the small arts of the crafty politician, he does not consult the Assembly about his proposed law against the Church. This would be to arouse the public to such a pitch of violence that his resignation from office might be rather painfully extracted from him. So he quietly steps around or over that objectionable Constitution; it would never do to advance such a measure whilst Congress is in session; certain unmentionable Deputies of a rather uncompromising and militant religious character might, who knows?

object to the law; he waits for the close of the session; no one is at hand to forcibly impress him with the unbearable fact that his project can only be realized by riding rough-shod over the rights of the people. No objections are made to his law (there is no one present to object). It is, therefore, passed with the unanimous acclamations of Count Romanones. Such is the policy of the present Liberal government, such its conduct when a law injurious to the Church must be enacted.

What remedy is there for so subtle a malady? One only appears to have the power of stopping its ravages: The force of organization, which Pope Leo XIII. so earnestly longed for and whose magnificent results wherever adopted Pius X. has so frequently pointed out in his urgent and eloquent appeals. Were the Catholics of Spain to banish dissensions, to form a powerful coalition, they would sweep the enemy into the Atlantic. Alas! it must be admitted that in the past there have dwelt in their camp idleness and division: the causes of failure, the enemies of success. Many were satisfied with a quiet, unperturbed private life; they refuse to meddle with politics; they never approached the ballot-box; they surrendered to the enemy without a blow. But their attitude has been changed, the outlook is every day brighter and more hopeful to the Catholic cause and more gloomy and desperate to that of their adversaries. Taught by the terrible events of the last few years, the eyes of Spanish Catholics are opened; the descendants of St. Ferdinand are marching to the field of political strife as the Spanish chivalry of old against the Moor. May God give them victory and complete the newly begun work of Spanish political regeneration.

R. B. Fau, S. J .

Woodstock, Md.

THE DEGENERATION OF FALSTAFF.

SIR JOHN FALSTAFF is a towering figure in the kingdom of letters. Widely different as he is from the faithful Achates of Virgil, the Beatrice of Dante, the Faust of Goethe, the Tartuffe of Moliere, the English comic giant, as a recent writer has not inappropriately styled him, has at least this in common with the great characters of the world's literature—he enjoys undying fame. Falstaff is a world figure. Neither time nor place nor circumstance can dim his memory in the minds of book-lovers the world over. Not all of Shakespeare's creations are so vested in immortality. The general reader may soon enough forget Launce and Speed, the chattering Gratiano, Osric the water-fly and Mariana of the moated grange. But Falstaff is wrought of the enduring stuff which Shakespeare put into his portrayals of Hamlet and Shylock, Malvolio and Lear.

Much has been written concerning the fat knight who was wont to hold his mock court in the Boarshead tavern, and most of it in a spirit of admiration and good-natured tolerance. The jolly old reprobate who consumes astonishing quantities of sack and "lards the lean earth as he walks along" does not readily lend himself to criticism carping and censorious. His very bulk disarms wrath; even the sternest critic succumbs to Sir John's preposterous logic: "Thou seest I have more flesh than another man; and therefore more frailty." He beguiles the reader into eulogy even as he once beguiled "Dame Partlet" into lending him four-and-twenty pounds.

And yet, withal, there are not lacking Shakespearean interpreters who visit Sir John with reluctant censure. Smilingly they shake their heads—but they shake their heads. Such commentators are in the minority, but their existence cannot be ignored. And as a consequence, we have, in the miles and miles of comment of which Falstaff is the subject, two varied trends of opinion concerning the fat knight. Is he an artist in humor or a lumbering clown? Is he keen-witted or fat-witted? Is he immoral or is he merely un-moral? Or is he, as Morgann would have us believe, a hopeless mass of contradictions—"a dupe and a wit, harmless and wicked, weak in principle and resolute by constitution, cowardly in appearance and brave in reality, a knave without malice, a liar without deceit, and a knight, a gentleman and a soldier without either dignity, decency or honor?"

The key to the problem is found in the not generally recognized fact that in the person of Falstaff Shakespeare presents us with a character that is not static, byt dynamic. Falstaff is not a study in still life; he is a presentation of character development, and, as we shall presently see, of downward development. A study of Falstaff as presented in the First Part of "King Henry IV.," where we make his acquaintance, continuing through the Second Part of "King Henry IV." and "The Merry Wives of Windsor" and concluding with the remarkable deathbed scene described by Mistress Quickly in "King Henry V.," will go far to show that practically all comments on Falstaff's character can be justified by this theory of downward development.

Sir John is at his best in the First Part of "King Henry IV." There, if anywhere, he is an artist in humor. In his imaginative feats, such as the "eleven buckram men grown out of two," and his mythical duel with the dead Hotspur, "fought a long hour by Shrewsbury clock," there is a titanic, a Munchausen element which is almost a form of genius. "Why," exclaims Prince Hal, "Percy, I killed myself, and saw thee dead." "Didst thou?" echoes Falstaff, with a countenance more in sorrow than in anger. "Lord, Lord, how this world is given to lying!"

If the Falstaff of the First Part of "King Henry IV." is now and then the victim of a joke, he is rarely a wholly unconscious victim; and invariably he is keen-witted enough to turn the point upon his tormentors. In what we are justified in regarding as Shakespeare's supreme comic scene (Act II., scene 4) the odds seem to be overwhelmingly against the fat knight. He has been caught red-handed as a knave, a coward and a liar. The Prince and Ned Poins allow him to dilate upon his heroism, and then prove conclusively that they are in possession of the facts in the case. "Come," Poins cries triumphantly, "your reason, Jack, your reason." "What, upon compulsion?" exclaims Falstaff, bristling with mock indignation. "Give you a reason on compulsion? If reasons were as plentiful as blackberries, I would give no man a reason on compulsion, I." And a little later, when convinced that the two men in buckram suits were the Prince and Poins: "I knew ye as well as he that made ye. Why, hear you, my masters: was it for me to kill the heir-apparent? Should I turn upon the true prince? Why, thou knowest I am as valiant as Hercules: but beware instinct; the lion will not touch the true prince. Instinct is a great matter; I was now a coward on instinct." Truly, no casuistic splitter of hairs ever achieved a more absurd distinction without a difference—"a coward on instinct!"

Falstaff sins against both honesty and good taste in his levying of troops; but with such unfailing good humor does he review his ragged cohorts that even the gravest moralist must laugh with him. "A mad fellow met me on the way," Falstaff chuckles, "and told me I had unloaded all the gibbets and pressed the dead bodies. No eye hath seen such scarecrows. . . . Nay, and the villains march wide betwixt the legs, as if they had gyves on; for indeed

I had the most of them out of prison." "I never did see such pitiful rascals," the Prince comments dubiously. "Tut, tut," responds Sir John, with magnificent disdain. "Good enough to toss; food for powder, food for powder; they'll fill a pit as well as better: tush, man, mortal men, mortal men."

Hazlitt is not far astray in emphasizing the theatrical element in much of Falstaff's humor—a quality which is best illustrated in his periodical fits of repentance. Repentance has for him no attraction; but he finds the rôle of penitent an alluring one. So ever and anon he pretends to purpose amendment, never getting beyond the pretense and never really wanting to get beyond it. In one such mood he confides to the florid Bardolph that formerly he "lived well, and in good compass: and now I live out of all order, out of all compass." Whereupon Bardolph remarks appositely enough: "Why, you are so fat, Sir John, that you must needs be out of all compass." "Do thou amend thy face," Sir John retorts, "and I'll amend my life."

That same shining face of Bardolph, "the Knight of the Burning Lamp," is an incessant source of inspiration for Falstaff's mirth. When Bardolph, moved by a not unreasonable resentment, ventures to protest, "Why, Sir John, my face does you no harm," Falstaff promptly agrees: "No, I'll be sworn; I make as good use of it as many a man doth of a death's-head or a *memento mori:* I never see thy face but I think upon hell-fire, and Dives that lived in purple. . . . When thou rannest up Gadshill in the night to catch my horse, if I did not think thou hadst been an *ignis fatuus* or a ball of wildfire, there's no purchase in money. O, thou art a perpetual triumph, an everlasting bonfire-light!" And so, hardly pausing to enjoy his own sallies, the fat knight evolves one conceit after another at the expense of the irritated Bardolph. Rough humor, some call it, and perhaps they are right; but at least it is humor, and humor, moreover, which could spring only from a rich fancy and an alert, constructive faculty.

Indeed, the Faltaff we meet with and laugh with in the First Part of "King Henry IV." is a thoroughly lovable old rascal, his wit shrewd and piercing, his humor abundant and contagious. His famous "catechism of honor" is like the bottle of sack he draws in lieu of a pistol on Shrewsbury field—a thing designed mainly for humorous effect. He is not repulsive, even in the flights of merriment that do not lend themselves readily to quotation; vulgar he may be at times—is there not an element of the vulgar in much manly mirth?—but he is never crass or revolting. Were we to see no more of old Jack Falstaff after he puts his tongue in his cheek and makes one more promise to "leave sack and live cleanly as a nobleman should do," we should be justified in styling him, as

Brandes has done, "one of the most glorious creations that ever sprang from a poet's brain."

But we meet Falstaff again; and in the Second Part of "King Henry IV." we find him a less amiable and a less keen-witted Falstaff. We still laugh with him, it is true; but, almost to our surprise, certainly to our regret, we find ourselves also laughing *at* him. Is it because his humor cloys upon us? Rather is it because the humor is thinner and grosser and less spontaneous. His tongue continues to run on and on—witness his chuckling outbreak to his page concerning the Prince's smooth face—but there is here less substance to his wit. His cleverness is on the wane. Now and again it flashes out in its old-time brilliancy, as when, with the same astounding self-sufficiency with which he once narrated his heroism at Gadshill, he now loftily tells the Chief Justice that he had not obeyed the summons of the court because he was so advised by his "learned counsel in the laws of this land service," and shortly afterward, having escaped prison and disgrace, has the unparalleled impudence to ask the magistrate for a loan of a thousand pounds; but the general impression we get from the play is that the gout which afflicts his great toe is exerting a subtle influence on his florid fancy and his stock of verbal pyrotechnics. Old Jack Falstaff is hard pressed, indeed, when he has to admit: "A good wit will make use of anything; I will turn diseases to commodity."

In other words, it is evident that the degeneration of Falstaff, mentally and morally, is well advanced. But once do we find him in company with his former boon companion, the Prince of Wales; and that rather disgusting scene does not redound in any way to Falstaff's advantage. Sir John is hard pressed to explain the scurrilous language he has used in speaking of the heir-apparent, and his explanation, in comparison with his immortal "coward on instinct" argument, comes off haltingly. It is significant that the foils for his wit in the Second Part of "King Henry IV." are not the agile Prince and Poins, but the Hostess and Mistress Doll, the blustering and ineffectual Pistol and the silly Justice Shallow. A verbal swordsman inevitably gravitates to foemen worthy of his steel.

But the most striking proof of the downward development of Falstaff as manifested in the Second Part of "King Henry IV." is that he wins our commiseration. Fancy the reader who could conceive the Falstaff of the First Part to stand in need of pity! But here, in the scene where he comes face to face with young King Henry V.—the gay Prince Hal of Eastcheap days—Falstaff is a figure almost pathetic. Foul and travel-stained, out at knees and elbows, the fat knight and his frowsy friends, Bardolph and Pistol, stand near Westminster Abbey, waiting to greet the newly elevated king. The coronation procession approaches, and Falstaff recognizes the familiar figure of the madcap scion of royalty. But, with an unwonted sinking of the heart, he sees that the Prince is strangely altered; dignity and grace have set their stamp upon that youthful brow. The victim of unaccustomed misgivings, Falstaff lifts his voice: "God save thy Grace, King Hal! My royal Hal! . . . My King! My Jove! I speak to thee, my heart!" A strange silence falls upon the crowded street; and then the young King speaks:

> I know thee not, old man; fall to thy prayers;
> How ill white hairs become a foll and jester!

And the procession passes on, leaving the little group dazed and silent; Pistol has lost his bluster, the light has faded from Bardolph's face; and Falstaff—yes, we pity him!

If for the Falstaff of the First Part of "King Henry IV." we entertain good-humored admiration and for the Falstaff of the Second Part of "King Henry IV." a pity more or less reluctant, our prevailing sentiment toward the Falstaff of "The Merry Wives of Windsor" is one of genuine contempt. From a brilliant and light-hearted comedian Sir John has degenerated into a stupid and clumsy clown. He himself admits that he is "made an ass." Instead of his rapier-like wit, we have his unconvincing slapstick comedy, and, his resourcefulness having diminished in proportion as his self-esteem has increased, we no longer watch his performances with even so much as a show of sympathy. He alienates friendship. In this play even his seedy companions, Bardolph, Pistol and Nym, desert him as rats desert a sinking ship; and he who, Yorrick-like, was wont to set the table in a roar, becomes the stupid butt of stupid practical jokes in Windsor town and Windsor forest. The laughter in "The Merry Wives of Windsor" is laughed not with Falstaff, but at him; and it is laughter, too, bereft of kindliness and even latent sympathy.

Morally, likewise, the Falstaff of "The Merry Wives of Windsor" is on a lower plane than the Falstaff who lied so artistically in the Boarshead tavern and so irresistibly played the coward on Shrewsbury field. He has become disgustingly gross. His language is coarser, his proclivities more sensual. His vulgarity in the earlier plays might be characterized as impropriety for the sake of wit; here it is obviously filth for the sake of filth. The Falstaff of Eastcheap was a jolly, keen-eyed giant, the famiilar cup of sack flushing his jovial countenance and oiling his clever tongue; the Falstaff of Windsor is a repulsive satyr, his eyes alight with the dull glow of carnal desire and his face discolored with the lees of the cup.

Even the most sympathetic critic fails to find anything admirable in the Falstaff of "The Merry Wives of Windsor." Thus, Hudson is compelled to admit that, at any rate, Sir John has met with limitations. "The truth is," he says, "Falstaff is plainly out of his sphere, and he shows a sad want of his usual sagacity and good sense in getting into it—in supposing for a moment that he could inspire such a passion in such a place. . . . Sir John is here conspicuous not so much for what he practices as for what is practiced upon him; he being, in fact, the dupe and victim of his own heroism, and provoking laughter more by what he suffers than by what he does."

One rather subtle writer has remarked that Falstaff alienates our affection because in this play he is so obviously in the toils of fleshly desires. The explanation is true, but inadequate. Sins of impurity are always hateful, but there are degrees of hate; and often, too, while hating the sin, we cease not to love the sinner. We do not turn against Launcelot and Guinevere when Tennyson describes their fall, and compassion fills our hearts at sight of Dante's Paolo and Francesca. But those immortal sinners were not wholly bad. In the case of Falstaff, however, we find a man emasculated, bestial, depraved and withal so utterly selfish and so preposterously convinced of his own worth that our gorge rises. Launcelot, though guilty, is a chivalrous knight; Paolo, though guilty, remains a man. But in the Falstaff of "The Merry Wives of Windsor" we behold but the head of a man on the body of a swine.

"Last scene of all, that ends this strange, eventful history" of downward development is the death of Falstaff as described by Mistress Quickly in "King Henry V." There is almost sublimity here; but then there is an element of sublimity in every death. When a man dies, says Mrs. Atherton, "his virtues rise and sit upon the corpse." In that supreme, tragic moment the "something good in the worst of us" comes to the fore. And so it is not surprising that the demise of Sir John, seen through the sympathetic eyes of a woman—and such a woman as Mistress Quickly—should make us forget much of the obliquity of the man and recall only his early charm. "For after I saw him fumble with the sheets, and play with flowers, and smile upon his fingers' end, I knew there was but one way; for his nose was sharp as a pen, and a' babbled of green fields."

Of that deathbed scene Rowe has said: "Though it be extremely natural, it is yet as diverting as any part of his life." The irony is delicious. There be those who refuse to consider the living Falstaff under all circumstances as other than "diverting;" should not consistency urge them to discover diversion in the dying Falstaff? It is just here that two widespread theories of Falstaff break down: One which insists on regarding him as un-moral, like Silenus or Bacchus; the other which, advanced most recently by Mr. W. L. George in the *British Review,* elects to regard him as a type rather than as an individual, and therefore as a quintessence or abstraction to which moral standards cannot rightly apply. Mr. Mabie is forced to admit that, though it would be "absurd to apply ethical standards to him" and that "he is a creature of the elemental forces," "yet the touch of the ethical law is on him; he is not a corrupter by intention, and he is without malice; but as old age brings its searching revelation of essential characteristics, his humor broadens into coarseness, his buoyant animalism degenerates into lust; and he is saved from contempt at the end by one of those exquisite touches with which the great-hearted poet loves to soften and humanize degeneration."

Though a great deal of well-meant, but injudicious sympathy has been bestowed on Falstaff, the process finds little sanction in Shakespeare's own attitude toward one of his most memorable creations. With almost nauseating emphasis, the dramatist makes Falstaff a horrible example of the fundamental truth of life, that what a man sows that also doth he reap. He shows us that Falstaff's view of life is superficial and that surface-thinking and surface-living grow into a habit fatal and ultimately inevitable. He shows us that Falstaff is self-indulgent and insincere, and therefore more and more incapable of rising to the sacrifices which the laws of life impose upon every man who would work out his salvation. He shows us that Falstaff is a victim of that subtle and corroding vice, self-pity; and though its earlier manifestations are amusing, it eventually reaches such proportions as to sicken and repel. He shows us that Falstaff, having sown the garden of his life with thorns and thistles, gathers therefrom no crop of grapes and figs; that Falstaff, drinking so avidly of sugared sack, may taste not the nectar of the gods.

BROTHER LEO, F. S. C.

Oakland, Cal.

Book Reviews.

THE MIGHTY FRIEND. By *Pierre L'Ermite.* Crowned by the French Academy. Translated from the French by John Hannon. 8vo., cloth, with eighteen illustrations and colored jacket, net, $1.50. New York: Benziger Brothers.

In this book the author has very cleverly succeeded in presenting a threatening condition of modern economics through the medium of a fascinating and splendid story, and while his tale is at no time given over to dry philosophical discussions of the problem presented, the very spirit and essence of the book is concerned with a phase of the conflict which is even now going on wherever the tentacles of trade have battened upon a smiling countryside.

"The Mighty Friend" is, of course, the land, the country, the real backbone and substance of the nation. When the Harmmsters, therefore, who are manufacturers from Paris, invade the Vale of Api with a commercialism whose immediate effects are baneful in the extreme, Jacques opposes the erection of their factories, as he is far-seeing enough to understand the inevitable result of such an invasion.

"The Mighty Friend" is a strong, purposeful drama, relieved by the lighter touches of a somewhat sardonic humor, and the question which furnishes the motif for its pages is one of vital importance to the individual, the family and the nation. The jacket, which is in four colors, and the illustrations, of which there are eighteen, add greatly to the value of the book.

Catholic literature needs a brilliant novel writer. It is looking for one; it demands one to offset these dangerous writers who are so clever in stirring up the mud and who are equally skillful in splitting hairs. Pierre L'Ermite may be that man. He has already attained that distinction. "The Mighty Friend" is his masterpiece thus far.

THE WESTMINSTER HYMNAL. Edited by *Richard R. Terry.* 12mo., cloth, with music, net, $1.25; words only, net, $0.20. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The ideal Catholic Hymnal has long been a moot question. The truth is that there cannot be any one ideal. The abundance of material, the differences of nationality, the varying tastes, make it impossible to compile one hymn book which will contain all the best hymns. For this reason every book of the kind which has been prepared by a competent person or persons is worthy of commendation and patronage. The Westminster Hymnal is excellent in every respect. It is issued with the sanction of the Archbishops and Bishops of the Provinces of Westminster, Birmingham and Liverpool. The hymns that it contains are those which make up the book of hymns already approved by the Bishops, with seven added to bring up the number to 250. The tunes have been in part selected and in part composed by Mr. R. R. Terry, Mus. D., organist and choirmaster of Westminster Cathedral, who has also written and edited the harmonies. This eminent musician has here presented the public with a work of great originality and distinction, for which he is entitled to the thanks of the Catholic Church in English-speaking countries.

This constitutes the first official collection of hymns issued for Catholics in England. Dr. Terry has composed a large number of tunes himself. We cannot recollect a hymn book in any language, as it were, in which so much skill and accurate knowledge have been shown in the immensely important matter of the harmonization of plain-song melodies as here.

THE ROMAN CURIA AS IT NOW EXISTS. By *Rev. Michael Martin, S. J.* Price, net, $1.50; postage 15 cents extra. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The author of the book is the Rev. M. Martin, S. J., professor of canon law and moral theology in St. Louis University, already known as the annotator of Slater's "Moral Theology." "The Roman Curia As It Now Exists" deals with a subject of absorbing interest and in a manner calculated to convey much information within a small compass. Very few persons, even ecclesiastics, have the time or the facility to study the work of the various congregations. Questions are constantly being asked concerning them to which it is hard to find the answer. For instance, What are the duties of such or such a congregation or tribunal of the Curia now as compared with what they were a few years ago? What countries were lately removed from the jurisdiction of the Propaganda Congregation? What is the effect of such removal in the United States and elsewhere? These and a hundred other questions may be asked regarding the present Roman Curia and will find an answer in this book. Here may be seen what the Roman Curia at the present day really is, its departments, the authority of each congregation and tribunal, the mode of procedure in transacting ecclesiastical business, etc.

THE HOLY HOUR. By *Right Rev. Benjamin J. Keiley, D. D.*, Bishop of Savannah. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The author in his foreword says: "I do not think it necessary to say a word of the great spiritual benefit to be derived from this devotion of the Holy Hour; one has but to make it to realize what hidden treasure of piety and love are found in it. There are many ways of making the Holy Hour, and it would, of course, be highly presumptuous to claim that the way suggested by me is the best. I can only say that it has been in use with us for quite a while and is enjoyed by the people, and I believe has been the means of much good. From the absence of any specific instructions governing these cases, priests often find a difficulty in conducting certain extra liturgical devotions, and they would be glad, I imagine, to find how others conduct them. On this account, I have determined to publish these suggestions."

The very modest price of this booklet—10 cents for a single copy and $6 for a thousand—will be an inducement for its introduction in large quantities, especially for organizations of the Blessed Sacrament.

OREMUS. The Priest's Handbook of English Prayers for Church Services and Special Occasions. 8vo., cloth, net, $1.50. New York: Wagner & Co.

There are a large number of priests who would be glad to have at their command a collection of prayers in the vernacular, for use on the various occasions when it is desired to have the congregation join with the priest in offering prayer in harmony with the occasion. Holy Mother Church greatly encourages a variety of prayers; in fact, in her various offices she insists on prayers specially composed for the occasion. The use of special prayers is of great value in confining attention and in stimulating devotion, and it is certain that the faithful welcome every opportunity to join in thought, at least, such special prayers of the priest.

Heretofore it was hard to find a satisfying collection of such prayers in convenient form. The book before us is well conceived and executed. It contains the prayers after Low Mass, the Divine Praises, the Stations and other prayers for Lent, for the monthly devotions to the Most Sacred Heart, Our Lady and St. Joseph, prayers for the sick and the dead, litanies, both those approved for public and for private devotion, and a long list of occasional prayers.

DISPUTATIONES THEOLOGIAE MORALIS Methodo Positiva, Scholastica, Casuistica Confectae ex fontibus S. Thomae Aquinatis et S. Alphonsi M. de Ligorio et e Probatis Recentioribusque Auctoribus Desumptae. Sac. *Arthurus Cozzi.* Quatuor Volumina. Taurini: Petrus Marietti.

A new work on moral theology in convenient form and strictly up-to-date is a constantly recurring necessity. While the principles of morality remain the same, the application of those principles must be modified in accordance with changes in Church discipline, in civil enactments and in other circumstances which vary in different countries at different times. The work of Dr. Cozzi is produced in answer to a demand of this kind. The learned author, who is doctor of theology, philosophy and teacher in both fields, is especially well equipped for the task. Besides following the great masters, St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Alphonsus, he has consulted the modern approved authors and has taken an account of the acts of the Holy See, even down to the latest. Finally, the civil law of Italy, France, Austria, Germany, Spain and Argentina has been studied and the decrees of the Plenary Council of Latin America have been taken into consideration. The result is a complete manual of moral theology, modern, yet ancient, in the proper sense of those two much misunderstood and much abused words. The work should receive approval and patronage beyond the ordinary.

UP IN ARDMUIRLAND. By *Rev. Michael Barrett, O. S. B.* 12mo., cloth, net, $1.25. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The scene of this story is laid in a little village of Scotland, among simple-living Catholic people. The pastor of this flock, whose delicate lungs enforce an indoor life during the bleak winter weather, has, at the suggestion of his twin brother, recorded the doings of his people, and, in some instances, the story of their lives, with the result that we have a delightful book. There is much of pathos and no little of humor in the telling of it; there is even a touch of the supernatural, for a real ghost is introduced. When we remember that the author is a priest of experience, we can imagine that most of the incidents of the story, especially that of the ghost, are actual happenings in his life. It is an unusual book, written in a simple style, and will hold the attention of the reader to the end.

SUMMARIUM THEOLOGIAE MORALIS. Scripsit Sac. *Nicolaus Sebastiani* S. Theol. et Utr. Juris Doctor. Augustiae Taurinorum: Petrus Marietti.

Good compendiums are scarce in all branches of knowledge. They are also dangerous. Scarce because only a master can condense matter in such a way as to preserve comprehensiveness and proportion without sacrificing accuracy and clearness. Dangerous because they may be mistaken as short cuts to learning or as substitutes for fuller treatises which bring completer knowledge and which should be mastered first. Dr. Sebastiani, with his ripe experience, was fully aware of these dangers, and warns his readers against them. He has written his book for the lawful uses to which a compendium may be put, and there is always a field for such a work. It may be safely said that those who take him for their master will not be disappointed.

DE CURIA ROMANO. Iuxta Reformationem a Pio X. Sapientissime Inductam. Sac. *Felix M. Cappello*. Vol. I.—De Curia Romana "Sede Plena." Vol. II.—De Curia Romana "Sede Vacante." Neo-Eboraci: Fr. Pustet.

This is a full and satisfactory treatise on a timely subject. When the Holy Father published his Constitution "Sapienti Consilio," reviving and readjusting the various congregations, those having business with them were, temporarily at least, somewhat puzzled. This was true especially of those who were living under the Propaganda. Everything bearing on the subject was eagerly sought and warmly welcomed, and several excellent treatises have already appeared. The work before us is, however, the most pretentious and authoritative so far, and it is so technically complete that it will probably become the tetx-book for students of the subject and the manual of diocesan officials.

THE ROAD BEYOND THE TOWN and Other Little Verses. By *Rev. Michael Earls, S. J.* 12mo., cloth, $1.25. New York: Benziger Brothers.

For those who enjoy sweet poetry and delightful sentiment in exquisite taste, we commend this striking volume of Father Earls'. "The Road Beyond the Town" is a splendid little volume of songs, ballads and sonnets written by a gifted Jesuit who has been excelling in verse-making since his school days at Georgetown. There is a dignity and a gravity about the entire collection that marks them in a superior manner. Many of the sonnets are suggestive of Father Tabb at his best. Some are dainty and fragile tributes to nature and breathe of a wondrous delicacy; others are strong and virile. Joy and gladness, sorrow and pain, all sound sweetly to the accompaniment of his poetic lyre.

HENRI HEINE, par *Pierre-Gauthiez.* 1 vol. in-16 broché, de la Collection des Grands Écrivains étrangers. Bloud et Cie, éditeurs, 7, place Saint-Sulpice, Paris (VI.).

This biography is the first complete study which has been written in France on the life of the great German poet. Drawn almost entirely from his works themselves and his correspondence, this study shows, with his greatness and his feebleness, his glory and his shame, the picture of a writer, curious and diverse. If the man, whether in his public or private character, gains nothing by being described with sincerity, the poet appears ever more admirable in the translations given by M. Pierre-Gauthiez. Such a book, consecrated to the artist who holds so great a place in the history of French romance, will not fail to awake the close interest of the literary public.

EPITOME E VESPERALIS ROMANI. Editione Ratisbonensi. Neo-Eboraci: Fr. Pustet.

Those who are familiar with the full vesperal which Pustet published in the beginning of this year will welcome the condensed edition which has just come from the press and which is especially adapted to the use of chanters in smaller parochial churches. The correctness of this edition is vouched for by the proper ecclesiastical authorities, and the book is as carefully and attractively made as its predecessor.

FRANCOIS BACON, par *Paul Lemaire*, Docteur dès lettres. 1 vol. in-16. Collection Science et Religion (Philosophes et Penseurs, n. 666). Bloud et Cie, édit., 7, place Saint-Sulpice, Paris (VI.).

To give a true idea of the genius of Bacon as it is expressed in his system, in place of abstracting the philosophy from his works, to personify it by making Bacon speak it, such is the aim of the author of this little book. He has succeeded and his interesting and instructive work will certainly be read with pleasure.

PERIODICAL

70770

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

DOES NOT CIRCULATE